

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE



Bulletin

Vol. XLV, No. 1153

July 31, 1961

THE UNDERLYING CRISIS: COERCION VS. CHOICE • <i>Address by Secretary Rusk and Question-and-Answer Period</i>	175
NEW LEARNING PROCESSES FOR DEVELOPING NATIONS • <i>Remarks by Assistant Secretary Coombs . .</i>	193
THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS • <i>Statements by M. Wilfred Goding and Tosiwo Nakayama</i>	201
SOVIET UNION URGED TO AGREE TO NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY; ITEM PROPOSED FOR 16TH SESSION OF U.N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY • <i>Texts of U.S. Note of July 15, Soviet Note of July 5, and U.S.-U.K. Letter to U.N.</i>	184

For index see inside back cover

THE
OFFICIAL
WEEKLY RECORD
OF
UNITED STATES
FOREIGN POLICY

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Bulletin

VOL. XLV, No. 1153 • PUBLICATION 7236

July 31, 1961

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication issued by the Office of Public Services, Bureau of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, United Nations documents, and legislative material in the field of international relations are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
52 issues, domestic \$8.50, foreign \$12.25
Single copy, 25 cents

Use of funds for printing of this publication approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 10, 1961).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated. The BULLETIN is indexed in the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature.

The Underlying Crisis: Coercion vs. Choice

Press release 484 dated July 10

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY RUSK¹

Last year, as a private citizen, I had the temerity to give three lectures on the conduct of our foreign relations. They dealt with the roles of the President, the Secretary of State, and the Congress. The first was published; the other two, happily, were not. The three were to make up a thin book—how thin I did not then appreciate. One matter which I underestimated was the problem of explaining foreign policy in a vigorous democracy, a democracy closely associated with more than 40 allies and in friendly relations with more than 50 so-called “uncommitted nations,” with, in the background, those also listening who would like to bring our democracy down.

Public officials are engaged in “inservice training,” and I am grateful to many of you for your help—intended and unintended—with my education during these first months of office. I deeply believe that the public should be fully informed about the world situation and our courses of action to deal with it. In no other way can we mobilize both the necessary effort of a people who act through consent and the unity which is critically necessary in hazardous times. I believe, as well, that responsible public officials should in their statements seek to serve the public interest and not merely its passing curiosity. The public has a right to know, including the right to know that its serious business is being handled in a responsible fashion. For example, if there are differences between us and friendly nations about one or another aspect of the passing parade of events, these are more likely to be resolved by quiet conversation than by a public quarrel. If two of our friends find themselves in difficulty with each other, it is not always conducive to agreement for it to be

publicly known that we have been offering friendly counsel.

And again, if a matter arises which is of deep concern to our allies and where unity among allies is critical to the sound handling of the issues involved, it is not always easy for the United States to sound off prematurely without consultation with those whose vital interests are also at stake.

But our policies are public, our purposes are those which the Nation itself enjoins upon its Government; in the main, our acts are public, because that is the way a democracy moves. But diplomacy cannot always be so, or else it would be little more than debate, adding its fuel to the very fires it hopes to quench.

The press and public officials have a common problem in presenting foreign policy issues to the American people. It is the problem of context. It arises in part because of the limitations of space and time limitations imposed upon both those who offer information and those who read or listen to it. It is almost never possible to give a complete story on each of the events which arouse public interest. You and we share the difficulty of reducing complexities to manageable proportions and of using accurately and economically the moments of attention we get from a busy and preoccupied nation.

We are accustomed to think of our foreign relations as a series of large or small crises. To do so is itself to distort out of context, for it overlooks the mass of constructive relationships which are steadily building across national frontiers and does not convey the sense of the persistent underlying crisis under which the world has lived since World War II.

Building a Decent World Order

As prelude to your questions, I should like to comment today on this underlying crisis from which many—but not all—of the troubles which attract our attention are derived.

¹ Made before the National Press Club at Washington, D.C., on July 10.

Let us start from where we ourselves are and what we in this country should like to achieve in our relations with the rest of the world. Since World War II we have had more than one so-called great debate about foreign policy. Actually, the greatest debate of all occurred during that war, and the most eloquent voice was the war itself. Before the fighting was over we had concluded as a nation that we must throw ourselves into the building of a decent world order in which such conflagrations could not occur.

The nature of that world order was set forth succinctly in the charter of the United Nations, a charter backed by an overwhelming majority of the Senate and supported by an overwhelming majority of the Nation. It called for a community of independent nations, each free to work out its own institutions as it saw fit but cooperating effectively and loyally with other nations on matters of common interest and concern. The inevitable disputes were to be settled by peaceful means; and let us not forget that the charter supposed that the tried processes of negotiation, mediation, and adjudication were to be preferred over violent or fruitless debate. But parties in serious dispute were to seek the help of the broader international community in order that disinterested judgments could be brought to bear upon sensitive or inflamed issues.

As such a world order grew in strength and effectiveness, the limitation and reduction of arms would become possible, cooperation on economic and social problems would improve the lot of man, human rights would be strengthened, and the role of law would steadily take over from the law of the jungle. On matters of political arrangements, the underlying thesis was that the people themselves should play the decisive role as the principle of self-determination was brought to bear. It was then, and remains, our hope that man can take up once again the ancient aspirations of the race and move to free himself from the burdens of war, tyranny, and misery.

With deference to our shortcomings, I think it can be properly said that the United States threw itself with honesty and diligence into this great effort. It rapidly demobilized—more rapidly than events proved wise. It offered its atomic weapons to international control. It committed vast resources to the reconstruction of war-torn nations.

It cooperated both in the large and in detail with the great cooperative ventures of the community of nations. Most important of all, it turned aside from the ambitions and appetites which have historically been associated with great power and conformed its national aims to those I have just described.

What Has Gone Wrong?

What has gone wrong? Why, after 15 years, is there so much tension and danger in a world which had hoped for so much just yesterday? To be fair, let us not suppose that all of our problems are traceable to a single source. Under the best of conditions, the surging tides of nationalism and the insistent demands for economic and social improvement would have required great skill and understanding to handle the inevitable changes which were bound to come in our post-war world. But these were manageable, and there is no reason to suppose that they could not be accommodated in the processes of peaceful change.

The underlying crisis of our generation arises from the fact that the Soviet Union did not join the United Nations in fact, as well as in form, and lend itself to the commitments they and the rest of us made in the midst of a great war. The possession of power was transformed once more to ambition for more power. The capacity to defy law became a contempt for law. Doctrines were revised and adapted to promote an imperialism as old as the tragic history of man. An entire people was sealed off from the rest of the world, and secrecy became a prime strategic weapon. The institutions of the international community were either ignored or undermined from within. The Soviet Union has just cast its 95th veto in the Security Council of the United Nations.²

In the process the very language of international intercourse became distorted and contrived. "Peace" has become a word to describe whatever condition would promote their world revolution. "Aggression" is whatever stands in its way. "People's Democracy" is a term applied to regimes no one of which has been chosen by free election. Self-determination is loudly espoused but only in areas not under Communist control.

² For background, see BULLETIN of July 24, 1961, p. 165.

The normally attractive word "negotiation" is used as a weapon, for the only subjects to be negotiated are further concessions to Communist appetite. Agreements are offered but against the background of a long and sobering list of broken promises; an agreement is apparently a rest camp, where one pauses and refits for a further advance. New assurances are offered in the very act of withdrawing those earlier given. Law, as one of their spokesmen put it, "is like the tongue of a wagon—it goes in the direction in which it is pointed." And the gains of lawlessness are cited as the "new conditions" which justify new invasions of the rights of others.

Neutrality is temporary, a pasture growing green for future grazing. On January 6 Mr. Khrushchev said, "The revolutionary emergence of more and more peoples into the world arena creates exceptionally favorable conditions for an unprecedented broadening of the sphere of influence of Marxism-Leninism. The time is not far away when Marxism-Leninism will possess the minds of the majority of the world's population." Apparently, according to one of his homely maxims, "Every vegetable has its season."

Central Issue of the Crisis

The underlying crisis is not an ideological conflict between 19th century capitalism and 19th century Marxism. It does not result from a bilateral conflict between the Soviet Union and the United States.

The central issue of the crisis is the announced determination to impose a world of coercion upon those not already subjected to it. If this seems exaggerated simplicity, let us not be misled by our own reluctance to believe what they say, for on this point they have proved that they mean it. At stake is the survival and growth of the world of free choice and of the free cooperation pledged in the charter. There is no "troika" on this issue—it is posed between the Sino-Soviet empire and all the rest, whether allied or neutral; and it is now posed in every continent.

The underlying crisis has shown itself in many forms—from the cynical disregard of the pledges on liberated areas, made at Yalta, to the latest threats to West Berlin. The calendar of conflict between these two dates is filled with un-

ceasing attempts to expand an empire—some successful but many repelled by those determined to be free.

Strengthening Western Solidarity

President Kennedy has taken up his great task with a deep awareness of the nature of the crisis and of the actions required by the continuing struggle for freedom.

It is essential to get on with the building of the world community designed by the charter. This we would do in any event; but it is here that the breadth and depth of the crisis are fully revealed, and it is here that those who would not be coerced can act together for a world of peace. We speak of uncommitted nations, and we usually mean those who are committed to neither of the principal blocs on the present scene. But all nations have commitments arising out of their own interests and out of their own hopes for the future. In the United Nations commitments to the charter can weave the fabric of common interest which, by reaching beyond the cold war, may determine its outcome.

No less essential is the strengthening of the solidarity of NATO and of the Western Community—possessed of enormous capacity to shape the course of events. The political, economic, and military strengthening of the Western Community is an urgent matter to which the administration is giving full attention. The President has also seen that the Western World must recapture the leadership of its own revolution of political freedom. It is a revolution which the West itself has taken into every continent and which continues to stir men to action. This struggle for freedom in the West itself was not painless; nor will it be in other places in our own time. But we dare not yield its leadership to those who would seize it, subvert it, and use it to destroy us.

The President is also asking us, and other economically advanced free nations, to reassert our leadership of the revolution of economic and social progress. The world of coercion is offering tempting bait for those who are determined to shake off their misery and want. We believe that freedom and progress are historic partners and that the alleged choice between rapid progress and free institutions is false. But this we must prove. This is the meaning of the President's Alliance for

Progress,³ which is stirring the hopes and the hard thinking of the nations of our own hemisphere. This is the meaning of the rapidly growing effort of the Western Community to throw substantial resources behind the economic and social development of less favored nations. This is why the President is asking for thoughtful planning, effective leadership, and determined self-help from those who need external assistance for national growth. And this is why the President is asking the Congress for aid legislation⁴ and appropriations which will put us in a position to help generate the momentum of development—aid which must be provided, in association with others, in the amounts and for the periods of time required to achieve enduring and satisfying results.

During these first months the President has established direct contact with the leadership of many nations in order to give us as quickly as possible an accurate understanding of their interests and views. In his own discussions with them, through the Vice President, Ambassador Stevenson, and others, he has been able to lay the basis for the greater unity of our several alliances and the greater effort which will be required to deal with the continuing crisis.

The President has recognized the changes which are occurring in the strategic problems which we and our allies must face and is moving, in consultation with other governments, to bring the free world's capabilities up to the needs of the variety of dangers which have to be confronted.

Effort To Relieve Arms Race

Despite the continuing crisis, we have felt it necessary to work diligently and realistically at the possibilities of disarmament. Even though the political atmosphere is not encouraging, an imaginative effort must be made to relieve the tensions arising from the arms race itself. We cannot understand how the Soviet Union, which has expended so much eloquence on disarmament, could have rejected the reasonable and workable treaty for the ban of nuclear testing which was tabled at Geneva this spring.⁵ "General and complete disarmament" are apparently among those words given a special meaning in the glossary of their world revolution. For reasonable people

would suppose that the way to get there is to start and that the steps along the way must be such as to leave no one, in Aristide Briand's words, as "dupes or victims." Nevertheless our work goes forward, and we earnestly hope that the Congress will support the recent proposals of the President to make it effective.⁶

Let me conclude by saying that the agenda of our foreign relations is filled with problems requiring and getting urgent attention. If there are those looking for still waters, we are not yet there. We can move on with confidence if we are prepared to do what has to be done. The free world has enormous strength, including the inner strength of purposes which are deeply rooted in the nature of man.

The world of coercion has its problems too. Dissensions within its ranks, national resistance to this modern imperialism, and a growing demand for freedom are among them. It has learned that economic aid does not buy puppets, that intimidation awakens its own resistance, that the United Nations is tougher than it thought, and that those who set out to "possess the minds" of man have set themselves against the course of history.

Our democracy must have its turbulent debate. Free nations will, of course, differ among themselves as they move to build a common interest out of disparate circumstances and varied responsibility. But the underlying crisis is becoming more widely understood, and out of it will come the responses which men must make when their freedom is at stake.

Thank you very much.

QUESTION-AND-ANSWER PERIOD

John P. Cosgrove, president of the National Press Club: Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Now, as you asked for it, the questions are here. We have a great number of questions to take up as you wish. The first one is: "Why does the State Department speak on foreign issues with many, often contradictory, voices instead of one clear voice?"

A. Well, I think we would have to parse this question into its particular parts. We try to speak, of course, with a single policy, the policy of the President and of the Secretary of State. But there

³ *Ibid.*, Apr. 3, 1961, p. 471.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Apr. 10, 1961, p. 507, and June 19, 1961, p. 977.

⁵ For text, see *ibid.*, June 5, 1961, p. 870.

⁶ *Ibid.*, July 17, 1961, p. 99.

are a great many people in the Department of State. You gentlemen have a most expert way of getting observations from a great many of them, and it is not beyond the limits of human frailty that different people will say different things. We are working toward this unity of policy, but I doubt that we shall ever fully achieve it.

Mr. Cosgrove: "Could you give us a congressional timetable on how the foreign aid bill will progress?"

A. I wish that I could. The hearings before the House Appropriations Subcommittee have been under way now for some time, even though the authorizing legislation has not passed the Senate and the House. We hope very much that that foreign aid legislation and the appropriations will be completed sometime in August.

Mr. Cosgrove: Of course these are just the warm-up questions, you understand. [Laughter.]

"It has been said that the United Kingdom is being dragged kicking and screaming into the European Common Market. Who is dragging it, the U.S. State Department?"

A. Whether the United Kingdom joins the Common Market is a question, of course, for the United Kingdom and the Common Market. We are not dragging anybody into anything in this situation. This is not a simple and easy question for either the United Kingdom or the Common Market. The United Kingdom has a great many relationships, economic in character, which do affect this question. It also has associations on the Continent with some who would not find it easy or comfortable to go with them into the Common Market. This is a problem which deserves a great deal of thoughtful attention on both sides in that discussion, and we ourselves are not telling either side what the answer ought to be.

Role of the Pentagon

Mr. Cosgrove: "How would you assess the role of the Pentagon on the formulation of U.S. foreign policy?"

A. Well, I have spent almost as much time in the Pentagon in the past as I have in the Department of State, and my impression of people in uniform is that they do not aspire to policy control or domination if there is policy guidance given

to them. I have known times when, shall I say, "we in the Pentagon" were forced to make policy because in certain situations we had troops in the field and they had to act, and in the absence of policy guidance we, in effect, made policy by the actions which someone had to take.

The problem is not one of undue military influence on policy. We have no problem of usurpation in this country. The problem is formulating clear policy guidelines and to get these transmitted to all the departments for their guidance and instruction. Well, I personally am not worried about the possible implications of this question.

Tensions Between Moscow and Peiping

Mr. Cosgrove: "Is there any solid evidence of a rift between Moscow and Peiping?"

A. I think there is solid evidence of some tensions between Moscow and Peiping, but I would use a little caution in trying to estimate the width of such gap as might be developing between them. There are some reports, some alleged documents and some speculation, some hopes which one must treat with a certain reserve. But, on the other hand, here are two great systems of power which are united in general in a certain doctrinal framework and which together have certain common interests vis-a-vis the rest of the world.

But there are also inherent in that situation certain inevitable rivalries, because the peoples and governments of these two countries cannot forget their own traditions, their own national feelings, and at times their own rivalries. I think that these irritations are present. I think that they are certainly of tremendous interest to everyone else. But I would not think that the prospect of such divisions would be a sound basis for policy for the free world.

The Berlin Issue

Mr. Cosgrove: "Mr. Secretary, General [Thomas D.] White said recently that there was a 'fair chance' of war over Berlin. Do you share that feeling?"

A. I think it would be quite wrong of me to speculate about the chances of war. The Berlin issue is, of course, a most serious issue. The basic rights of the Western Powers in West Berlin are being challenged. The long-range security and viability of West Berlin are being challenged.

And the rights of access are under pressure. These moves of the Soviet Union present the rest of us with some most serious questions. But I do not believe it would be helpful for those of us in responsible positions to feel that we must make a new statement about Berlin on each occasion on which we might meet the public or the press in one or another occasion.

As you know, the aide memoire—the reply to the aide memoire¹—is now under consultation with other governments. We hope to have that available for publication before too long. But this is going to be a question which will be with us for quite a few weeks and quite a few months ahead. I would be surprised if there were spot daily news on specific developments. This is a matter which will require a great deal of thought, intensive consultation among governments, and we must deal with it as soberly as the issues require.

Mr. Cosgrove: "What do you think of Mayor Brandt's [Willy Brandt, Mayor of West Berlin] proposal of a peace conference on Germany with all 52 nations which were at war attending?"

A. I believe that Mayor Brandt's proposal has been commented upon by other high German officials and that this discussion is going on in the midst of an electoral campaign in Germany. I think it is the better part of discretion for me to stay out of that one. [Laughter.]

Mr. Cosgrove: "Would not the Berlin problem be eased if the U.S. simply recognized the existence of the East German Government?"

A. Well, I suppose it might be eased in a way. It would also be eased if we got out of West Berlin. This question of dealing with the many separate aspects of the problem, one by one, is not an easy one. There is a *de facto* situation in Germany. There has been no indication on the part of the West, including West Germany, to upset or disturb that *status quo* by force; so the situation in East Germany, insofar as the West is concerned, is reasonably stable.

But these questions of recognition, of long-term commitments in Germany are for the future. The West has believed for many years, and still does, that a permanent settlement in Central Europe

can best be achieved on the basis of the self-determination of peoples. In tangled questions of this sort it is instinctive—certainly on the part of the American people—to ask the question, "What do the people themselves think about it?" And in this situation, alas, it has not been possible over the years since the war to get that question answered.

Mr. Cosgrove: "What do you think of Senator [Wayne] Morse's idea to bring the Berlin conflict before the World Court via the U.N.?"

A. I think we can suppose that at some stage the Berlin question might well come to the attention of the United Nations, as do almost all important questions involving tensions and threats addressed to the peace.

The problem of our taking one or another aspect of it to the World Court is determined in part by the almost certain refusal of the Soviet Union to accept the jurisdiction of the World Court for this purpose. Now, it is true that either the Security Council or the General Assembly could ask the Court for an advisory opinion on one or another aspect of the Berlin problem. But the Court would be free—as it has done on at least one other occasion—the Court would be free to decide that it would not wish to submit an advisory opinion. So there are a good many problems between the suggestion and its execution.

Mr. Cosgrove: Mr. Secretary, here's a very direct one: "How great is the danger of nuclear war over Berlin?"

A. I think most in the room would agree with me that I really ought not to answer this question at this time.

Mr. Cosgrove: "How is the repatriation of German prisoners of war in the Soviet Union progressing?"

A. The repatriation of German prisoners of war in the Soviet Union—unfortunately, and I regret to say it, I'm simply not briefed on the latest developments on this point and cannot factually answer. I'm sorry.

Mr. Cosgrove: "What is the position of the United States in reference to the use of space for offensive weapons systems?"

A. We would be glad to see space reserved for

¹An aide memoire on the subject of Berlin was handed to President Kennedy by Premier Khrushchev during their meeting at Vienna June 2-4.

peaceful purposes. We would be glad to see space become a basis for the most intimate and intensive cooperation among nations for the benefit of all mankind. We have been told by the Soviet Union that international cooperation in space activities can only come after general and complete disarmament has been achieved. This suggests that such cooperation is a long time off.

Cuba and the Problem of Coexistence

Mr. Cosgrove: "President Kennedy has said that we will never abandon Cuba to communism. Can you assure us we have not done so?"

A. Yes. [Laughter.]

Mr. Cosgrove: Sometimes the hardest ones are the easiest ones. "Is there any possibility of coexistence between the U.S. Government and Castro's communistic government?"

A. The problem of coexistence is a more general one between the Sino-Soviet bloc and the free world, of which the Cuban affiliation with the Sino-Soviet bloc becomes a part. In a certain sense we have been coexisting with the Soviet Union since 1917 without a direct clash between us and them. But I think we have to consider as a very serious development the fresh impetus given by the Sino-Soviet bloc to its notion of the historically inevitable world revolution backed with considerable energy, substantial resources, and a good deal of subtlety and sophistication all over the world.

Since about 1954 the Sino-Soviet bloc has been moving toward new techniques of penetration and subversion, adding to their earlier weapons, not substituting for them. So I would suppose that this is a part of this underlying crisis about which I spoke in my remarks. And I believe that if this crisis continues, we are in for some very troublesome times ahead and there will come a time when the crisis has to be settled.

Question of China's Seat in the U.N.

Mr. Cosgrove: "Do you believe Communist China might be seated in the U.N. this fall? Would we oppose this?"

A. I think it rather unlikely, indeed most unlikely, that Communist China will be seated in the United Nations this fall. And we ourselves are certainly not in favor of it. We believe it

important to support the Government of the Republic of China and its seat in the United Nations.

Now, there is a problem, as most of you know, in the parliamentary situation in the General Assembly. For 10 years we have been relying upon what is called the moratorium, a formula in which I have a certain paternal interest because I helped to invent it some 10 years ago. But under this formula, this General Assembly simply passes a motion, putting off for another year a consideration of the question of the so-called Chinese seat.

Now, delegations in recent years have been reporting from New York that this moratorium formula is running out of support. Now this is confirmed by such information as we have from other governments. It certainly at this point seems to be a dangerous point on which to rely. And so we and other governments, including the Government of the Republic of China, must address ourselves to the parliamentary problems which will arise in the forthcoming meeting of the General Assembly.

There is no single answer to this question, but this is a matter on which feelings run high in some places, about which there are differences of view and judgment, and something on which we shall be consulting with other governments between now and the Assembly meeting in September.

Recognition of Outer Mongolia Being Studied

Mr. Cosgrove: "Mr. Secretary, when we recognize Outer Mongolia, what will be the effect on our relations with Nationalist China?"

A. Well, this question of the recognition of Outer Mongolia has been under study, and we have been talking with other governments about it. We have not taken final steps with regard to this at this time. It is a question on which governments have different views, and the Government of the Republic of China, of course, has some strong views about it. But we think that this is a point on which allies and demonstrated friends can talk about it, can think about it together, and consider all of the ramifications and hopefully come to some agreement. It may not be possible; it is not always necessary for allies to agree with each other on every point, and disagreement on such a point is no reflection upon the solidarity of the alliance itself.

Mr. Cosgrove: "Would you tell us where America's defense perimeter in the Pacific is?" [Laughter.]

A. Ten years and five months ago a speech was made at this rostrum on that subject. I think I will let the situation stand as it is because we have a network of alliances and commitments in that part of the world which are now a matter of public record and we take them seriously.

Relations With Neutral Nations

Mr. Cosgrove: "How uncommitted are Ghana and Guinea? Do you see any problems in support for nations that assume the posture of Ghana or Guinea?"

A. Without commenting specifically on two particular countries, let me include these in a more general remark—that I think we ought to be a little careful about categorizing other nations' foreign policies too quickly, because things are never quite as simple as that and there are opportunities in relationships which ought to be developed.

I recognize that, in the case of the certain so-called neutral countries, a year or so ago it was supposed that they had been "lost" or that they had joined the opposing camp. I think we ought to be careful about leaping to such conclusions. I think we ought to bear in mind the attitude of the football team or the baseball team—play for the breaks. If you don't play for them you won't be ready for them, and you may very well get them. And in a number of these situations there are indications that the breaks can occur. And we ought to have relationships which will make those breaks productive.

Mr. Cosgrove: "Mr. Secretary, Pakistan's President Ayub Khan will be here on Thursday. This question pertains to him. Pakistan's President Ayub Khan complains that we give no special consideration to the views and needs of committed allies such as Pakistan. What is your policy toward relations with neutral nations? Do you favor discrimination in favor of allies?"

A. A country which has more than 40 allies and which has important interests and relations with more than 50 so-called uncommitted nations finds this a particularly difficult question to answer in general terms. I have said in my opening re-

marks that I do believe that the most far-reaching, underlying issues of our times are those which pit the Sino-Soviet bloc against all the rest. And on that underlying issue—that is, of national independence, of freedom of choice—there is no appreciable difference among any of the members of the free world, including the neutrals.

But, on the other hand, we have special relations with our allies. The terms of those alliances do not indicate that we would emphasize special treatment, although in fact special treatment has in the usual case gone forward. What these alliances represent is a mutual commitment—of our strength, of our lives, of our future—to the security and safety of each other. That is the essence of the alliance. And other considerations are for discussion. I think we ought to be in a position where we can develop steadily the strength of our alliances but also help to build this great world of choice which includes neutral nations.

Mr. Cosgrove: "On several occasions you referred to Khrushchev's January 6th speech. What is your diagnosis of this speech and its meaning for the non-Communist nations in the 1960's?"

A. I personally believe that as many Americans as can ought to read this January 6th speech of Mr. Khrushchev's carefully and with the utmost seriousness. This may be superseded in the autumn by the conclusions of the Party Congress, which will meet in October, but it seems to me to represent a frank statement of the long-term purposes of the Soviet Union and of the international Communist conspiracy. I do think that we should take it for what it is—a statement of purpose, and purpose backed by action—and that we should not dismiss it simply as a piece of propaganda.

Mr. Cosgrove: "Should more emphasis be given to our valuable cultural exchange program so well handled by the State Department?"

A. I think Mr. Coombs [Philip H. Coombs, Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs] must have put this question. [Laughter.]

We are very much interested in the cultural exchange program because we believe it is the kind of program which shows America at its best and establishes contacts with other nations in an atmosphere and a framework which means soli-

clarity across the years ahead. I can't exaggerate the importance of such programs. This is a field in which I spent a good deal of time in private life and have seen some of the direct as well as the indirect benefits of such activities. I hope that we are handling them as well as the question suggests, but nevertheless I deeply feel that they must be continued and expanded and developed further.

Mr. Cosgrove: Mr. Secretary, I wish we had time for all the questions that we haven't yet touched, but the time is drawing short and before asking the last question I'd like to present to you as a token of our appreciation of your being here this certificate and a copy of "Etaoin Shrdlu," the first 50 years of the National Press Club.

Now for the last question: "Do you regret that article of yours on summit diplomacy in Foreign Affairs quarterly?" [Laughter.]

A. No, not really. [Laughter.] I was then in the position of a gloriously irresponsible private citizen. I think the article made sense and makes sense. I think that those who are carrying official responsibility have to reserve their right to use all instruments freely and flexibly at their disposal to get on with the national interest. I think perhaps if I were writing that article again today that I would add at least a few sentences here and there.

United States Replies to Soviet "Troika" Proposal

Statement by Secretary Rusk¹

Press release 496 dated July 14

Throughout history men have dreamed of a world organization capable of preserving the peace. After World War I the League of Nations was established for this purpose but failed because of internal weakness and defiance by aggressive powers. After World War II the United Nations was created to preserve the peace and security which are now essential as the alternative to the destruction of civilization.

¹Read to news correspondents on July 14 by Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs.

It is therefore particularly regrettable that Chairman Khrushchev persists in his assault on the United Nations. In Moscow this week he stated flatly: "To preserve the situation which now exists in the United Nations means to pave the way to the ruin and death of that international organization."

No one else wants the "ruin and death" of the United Nations. The reason he objects to the United Nations, as he said, is "the situation which now exists" there.

The basic situation "which now exists" in the United Nations is that the Organization has acquired a capacity to act to preserve the peace and security of the smaller nations which make up the great majority of its membership. This does not appear to suit the plans of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Khrushchev contends that he wants an organization in which "all countries belonging to the United Nations have equal rights and enjoy equal opportunities." This is what we have now—and what he does not like. To destroy these equal rights and opportunities, Mr. Khrushchev last year launched his proposal for a three-headed Secretary-General, which he repeated on Monday.

Under this proposal, the executive organ of the U.N. would not be administered by international civil servants but by "three persons representing the three principal groups of states." This reflects Mr. Khrushchev's pretension that the world is divided into three "blocs." There is only one bloc in the United Nations which takes its orders from a single authority: the Communist bloc, which represents 10 percent of the members. The other 90 percent are free to think and decide for themselves although they tend to group themselves by cultural and political sympathies and common interests.

The so-called "troika" proposal flies in the face of everything we know about effective administration. But the real point of it is that a majority of the members of the United Nations—countries in Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America—would have a total of one vote among them in the executive direction of the U.N.—and that vote could be nullified by a veto. The United Nations would be powerless to act on any proposal that did not suit the purposes of the Soviet Union.

Thus Mr. Khrushchev's assault against the United Nations is, in reality, an attack on the "equal rights and equal opportunities" now en-

joyed by all members of the General Assembly—and the protection afforded them by the U.N.'s peace-keeping machinery.

An impressive majority of the members already has answered Mr. Khrushchev's assault on the integrity of the United Nations when they rejected his outrageous demand, during the Fifteenth General Assembly, to replace the Secretary-General with a three-headed directorate. Mr. Khrushchev

made it very clear on Monday that he will continue to press his attack. There is no way that the Soviet Union can impose his proposal. This would mean an amendment of the charter, which requires the consent of the United States and other permanent members of the Security Council. We would not consent, nor would the necessary two-thirds of the General Assembly. The United Nations will not destroy itself.

Soviet Union Urged To Agree to Nuclear Test Ban Treaty; Item Proposed for 16th Session of U.N. General Assembly

Following is an exchange of notes between the United States and the Soviet Union concerning the Geneva test ban negotiations, together with a letter of July 15 from the U.S. and U.K. delegations at the United Nations to the Secretary-General requesting inclusion in the agenda of the 16th session of the General Assembly of an item entitled "The Urgent Need for a Treaty To Ban Nuclear Weapons Tests Under Effective International Control."

EXCHANGE OF NOTES

U.S. Note of July 15

Press release 497 dated July 15

The Embassy of the United States of America presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and has the honor to state the following:

The United States Government has examined the reply of the Soviet Government of July 5, 1961 to the note of the Government of the United States of June 17, 1961¹ on the question of the nuclear test ban negotiations. Apparently in an effort to avoid the question of halting nuclear weapons tests under effective international control, the Soviet note contains a multitude of irrelevant and unwarranted comments. The United

States Government sees no point in replying to these comments.

Instead, the United States Government prefers to confine its reply to the Soviet Government to the central issue in the nuclear test negotiations. This issue is clear: it is whether the Soviet Union is now willing and prepared to reach an accord which would halt nuclear weapons tests under effective international control.² For its part, the United States is fully prepared to accept all the necessary international controls in its territory to insure that nuclear testing is effectively halted. It fails to understand why the Soviet Union considers that these same controls which are strictly limited in scope to fit technical and organizational requirements would jeopardize its national security.

In an effort to achieve a basis for final agreement at the earliest possible time, the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom have made numerous proposals designed to accommodate Soviet positions on international inspection and control. In many cases these proposals have met the Soviet position completely. Yet the reaction of the Soviet Government to our efforts to narrow the gap between the two sides has been

¹ For text of a U.S.-U.K. draft treaty submitted to the Conference on the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapon Tests on Apr. 18, 1961, see *ibid.*, June 5, 1961, p. 870; for a history of the political and technical developments of the negotiations from Oct. 31, 1958, to Aug. 22, 1960, see *ibid.*, Sept. 26, 1960, p. 482.

² For text, see BULLETIN of July 3, 1961, p. 18.

to create new obstacles to agreement and lately, to propose that a treaty banning nuclear weapon tests should await agreement on, and perhaps indeed implementation of, general and complete disarmament.

The United States stands ready to negotiate a general disarmament agreement as rapidly as this can be done. It is clear that an immediate agreement to end nuclear weapon tests would aid in the achievement of such a disarmament agreement and equally clear that failure to reach agreement on a test ban would in all likelihood hinder efforts to conclude swiftly an accord on disarmament. The fact that the Soviet Union resists so strenuously the limited control measures required by a nuclear test ban treaty can only cause grave concern for the possibilities of achieving effectively controlled disarmament.

This contrast between the attitudes of the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom, on the one hand, and the Soviet Government on the other, has been and is being brought into sharp relief in the conference proceedings on the question of how the control system should be managed and directed.

An issue which the Soviet Government had long described as one of the most important facing the conference was the issue of the composition of the Control Commission. The United States and the United Kingdom have agreed to equality of representation with the Soviet Union on this supreme supervising organ of the control system. There would be four representatives from each of the two sides and three neutral representatives. The Soviet Union and its allies would participate directly in the Control Commission in its task of setting the guidelines for operation of the control system and maintaining supervision over it.

Despite this significant move, which gave the Soviet Union an equal voice with the United States and the United Kingdom in guiding the affairs of the control system, the Soviet Union demanded still greater powers to impose its will on the control organization. Retreating from an agreed provision of the treaty, the Soviet Union has unfortunately chosen to advance the proposal that day-to-day administrative and executive authority over the international control system be exercised by a three-man administrative council. This council, on which each of the two nuclear sides and non-associated states would be repre-

sented, could take action only by unanimous consent so that the implementation of both the decisions of the Control Commission and the provisions of the treaty itself could be freely frustrated or vetoed. The effect of this proposal would be the paralysis of the entire control organization and would surely make a mockery of effective international inspection.

It cannot be argued that this new Soviet proposal was necessary to protect Soviet security interests. Under agreed provisions of the treaty, the Soviet Union has received ample assurance that administration of the control system will be competent and impartial. The Administrator is made accountable to the policy-making Control Commission, and works under its continuous supervision. His appointment and the appointment of his first deputy requires the concurring vote of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has the right to nominate two Deputy Administrators. The staff of the control organization is appropriately divided so as to provide equality between the two nuclear sides. Decisions as to the total amount of each annual budget, and the decisions as to amendment of the treaty, require the concurring vote of the Soviet Union. From this it is abundantly clear that concern over the Administrator's activities could not have been the motivating cause for this Soviet demand for a tripartite administrative council.

In an attempted justification for its tripartite administrative council proposal, the Soviet Government states that "There is no one person who can live in a society and not be influenced by one or another ideology and by mutual relations which exist between different groups within society. Neutral countries exist, but there are not and cannot be neutral people."

The Government of the United States believes that this rejection of the idea of an international civil servant acting impartially under guidance from international policy-making organs constitutes nothing less than an attack upon the executive capacity of any international organization for effective action. There are, of course, many people who are capable of exercising independent judgment in behalf of the international community; the whole history of international organizations bears witness to this fact. The United States rejects this Soviet contention categorically and is convinced that nations which do not wish to sub-

mit to the domination of great powers will also reject it.

This is a striking example of the Soviet Union's attempt to sabotage the Geneva nuclear test ban negotiations. It is not the only example, however, as was pointed out in the June 17 note of the U.S. Government. The Soviet refusal to accept more than three on-site inspections a year; the demand that international control posts and inspection teams in Soviet territory be headed by Soviet nationals; the Soviet insistence on criteria for on-site inspection which would seldom, if ever, permit an on-site inspection to be made regardless of how suspicious a detected event might be—all these are examples of the Soviet resistance to negotiating an effective nuclear test ban agreement in Geneva.

For its part, the United States Government must express its profound regret at the turn of events that has taken place in the test ban conference. The United States still regards the reaching of an agreement as a prime objective of its national policy. It repeats its readiness to negotiate in a reasonable spirit with the Soviet Government on the terms of a test ban treaty. Despite the lateness of the hour, the United States believes that the Soviet Government cannot be insensible to the demands of millions of people everywhere that agreement be reached urgently to ban nuclear weapons tests under effective control.

A binding treaty with effective controls would guarantee against hazards involved in testing; it would be a first step along the road towards accord on disarmament and towards the improvement of East-West relations; and it would inhibit the spread of nuclear weapons manufacturing capability. The prize we seek is too valuable and the consequences of our failure to win it are too serious to permit the luxury of indulging in narrow and temporary national interests. The United States Government makes common cause with all humanity when it urges the Soviet Government to allow the negotiators at Geneva to get on with their work.

Soviet Note of July 5

Unofficial translation

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR presents its compliments to the Embassy of the United States of America and has the honor to state the following:

The Soviet Government has examined the reply of the Government of the United States of 17 June 1961 to the

Aide Memoire on the question about suspension of tests of nuclear weapons, handed to the President of the United States of America Kennedy at the time of the meeting with the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, N. S. Khrushchev, in Vienna 4 June of this year.* From this reply it is evident that the Government of the United States unfortunately has not agreed with proposals of the Soviet Government which have as their purpose the facilitating and hastening of the solution of the problem of suspension for all time of tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons.

All the contents, and indeed even the tone of the note of reply of the Government of the United States of America, bespeak that in place of businesslike and constructive exchange of opinions, the Government of the United States has entered another path—the path of distortion of Soviet proposals and idle fabrications in connection with the position of the Soviet Union. The Government of the United States of America clearly is trying to sharpen polemic and at the same time to introduce into it elements which have no connection with the question discussed. All this, as is evident, is intended as efforts to remove from the United States responsibility for the fruitless negotiations in Geneva. In this there is not evident even a shadow of a wish to facilitate achievement of agreement on suspension of nuclear tests. On the contrary, from the American note the thought is directly suggested that the Government of the United States is concerned now only with one thing—how to justify in the eyes of public opinion resumption of tests of nuclear weapons which have been prepared in the United States of America, under what pretext to burn bridges to agreement of the powers on prohibition of such tests. Even the American press does not hide that the military organization of the United States of America—the Pentagon—and the American Atomic Energy Commission are only waiting for that day when they will be given the signal to continue nuclear tests.

It is evident therefore that the Government of the United States of America is trying to present the entire course of negotiations of the three powers in Geneva in a distorted light. The Soviet Government considers it necessary to remind of the basic facts concerning the negotiations on the question about suspension of tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons and, in particular, the position of the sides at the Geneva Conference.

The Soviet Union during the course of many years has consistently maintained that the world should be delivered forever from any nuclear explosions, whipping up the race of atomic armament and posing a threat to the life and health of people. It was none other than the Soviet Union which was first of the atomic powers to pose the question about the necessity of ending without delay dangerous experiments with nuclear weapons.

Desirous of facilitating achievement of international agreement on this question the Soviet Union even in March, 1958, ceased on a unilateral basis tests of nuclear weapons although it was known that the USSR had carried out fewer test explosions than the United States of

* For text, see *ibid.*, July 3, 1961, p. 22.

America and England. How then did the Governments of the United States of America and Great Britain reply to this? They replied with a new series of test explosions of nuclear bombs unprecedented in their intensity. But the Soviet Union continued its line on the general and urgent suspension of nuclear tests.

In 1959 the Soviet Government adopted a decision not to resume nuclear explosions if the Western Powers for their part would not conduct such explosions. And the Soviet Union has strictly adhered to the responsibility taken upon itself regardless of the fact that France—an ally of the United States of America and Great Britain in the NATO military bloc—regularly conducts nuclear tests.

The Geneva Three-Power Conference itself was convoked as a result of insistent efforts of the Soviet Union. Indeed, the entire history of the Geneva talks is above all a history of incessant searching by the Soviet Union for mutually acceptable solutions regarding prohibition of all tests of nuclear weapons. It is known that the Soviet Union, in the interest of achieving agreement, accepted the whole series of proposals of the United States and England on important points of the draft agreement being worked out. And if certain progress has been achieved at the Geneva Conference, this is in the first instance due to the good will and genuine striving of the Soviet Union to move forward the matter of ending tests.

But what has been the position of the Government of the United States and other Western Powers? Under various invented pretexts they have obstructed the solution of this problem. To whom is it not known that it is just the Western Powers—and above all the Government of the United States—which have for a long time generally come out against talks on ending of tests of nuclear weapons?

If one sees the course of the Geneva Conference not in a curved mirror, as the Government of the United States attempts to do, but in a real light, then it becomes obvious to any even slightly objective observer that in fact the United States has during the course of the whole Geneva Conference exerted efforts to hinder working out of an agreement on ending of tests of nuclear weapons. There are not a few facts which say that if the positions of the United States and Great Britain had not been directed toward wrecking agreement, then the work of the Geneva Conference would have long ago been completed and an agreement would have been signed.

Favorable conditions, for example, existed in 1958 after the Conference of Experts of the United States, England, the Soviet Union, and other countries, which thoroughly examined methods of detecting nuclear explosions and unanimously worked out recommendations on questions of controls for suspension of tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons.⁴ The matter only remained for the governments which participated in the negotiations and approved these recommendations to conclude quickly an agreement on these bases on suspension of tests of nuclear weapons.

At the conference of representatives of the USSR, the United States of America and Great Britain which opened at Geneva, a number of articles of the draft treaty

on cessation of tests was agreed. But this obviously seriously disturbed those circles in the United States of America who have been and are alarmed by the very possibility of the prohibition of nuclear tests. It is a fact that the American Government went back on its word and made attempts to review, and in essence to repudiate, recommendations of its scientific experts which it had itself confirmed.

The United States of America Government has gone to not insignificant effort to discredit these recommendations. Its representatives have maintained above all that the system of control of underground explosions which was worked out by experts in 1958 is allegedly insufficiently perfected. Basing itself on this fictitious argument, the United States of America demanded at first exclusion from the treaty of all conditions concerning prohibition of underground tests of nuclear weapons. Having met decisive objections from the Soviet Union, it then came forward with a proposal for excluding from the treaty the question of underground nuclear experiments below a defined power.

Representatives of the United States of America unwaveringly justified all their demands by asserting that the system of control worked out by experts is not reliable and it is impossible to rely on it. However, in the opinion of the scientific experts who worked out the recommendations, it is fully possible already at the present time to detect violations by states of agreement on suspension of tests, and consequently to guarantee fulfillment of the obligations undertaken by them.

But even if the system of control were not complete in some measure, this cannot at all be considered as a hindrance to the reaching of an agreement, since the more science and technology developed the more perfected instruments there will be, and, as a result, the system of control will also be improved. Therefore, in that part of the draft agreement in which it is agreed, there is a clause providing that the control organization will introduce improvements into the system of control within two years after the treaty on the prohibition of tests becomes valid, to be followed by possible yearly revisions in the light of accumulated experience and scientific progress.

The United States of America Government purposely ignores this important stipulation which was agreed to as a result of protracted efforts. References to technical incompleteness of methods of control show once again that the United States of America is not interested in honestly reaching an accord on agreement which once and for all would put an end to nuclear tests, and is seeking various loopholes to get around the treaty, turning it into an empty paper. Is this not borne witness to by the fact that the United States, in attempting to impose such a treaty, is demanding that renunciation of underground tests of atomic bombs of little power (i.e. a so-called moratorium on these explosions) be established only for a period of three years? But what sense would there be in agreeing to such a moratorium which the United States proposes? Actually this would lead to a situation where the territory of the USSR would be placed under control and within three years the United States would have the possibility to renew under some artificial pretext tests of nuclear weapons. It is understand-

⁴For text of a report of the Conference of Experts, see *ibid.*, Sept. 22, 1958, p. 453.

able to everyone that control over suspension of nuclear tests would under these conditions be completely transformed into collection of espionage information.

Thus the position of the United States in the question of underground explosions already makes agreement impossible. However, this is not the only question in which the Government of the United States by example has demonstrated its unwillingness to conclude an agreement.

In its note, the United States Government is trying to publicize proposals made by the United States Delegation recently at the Geneva Conference. But with this there is a purposeful silence about the fact that the position of the United States Government has not changed in the main. Specifically: in the question of recognition of full equality of sides, of guaranteeing them equal conditions of control without which reaching of an agreement is inconceivable. In order to seriously approach conclusion of an agreement it is necessary above all to remove these barriers, for only in such a case can the Geneva Conference get out of its impasse and the way to agreement be cleared.

In connection with this, it is impossible to ignore the objections of the United States Government against proposals of the Soviet Government that at the head of the control organization there should be not a single administrator but an administrative council consisting of equal representatives of three basic groups of states: socialist states, capitalist states in the Western military bloc, and neutral states. The Soviet Government, having proposed creation of such an administrative council, proceeded from real facts of contemporary international life, from the necessity to create equal conditions for representatives of all three groups of states and to exclude any possibility whatsoever of misuse of executive power in the control organ and of infringing the security of countries participating in the treaty.

The United States Government in its note of June 17 also recognizes that the system of control must be set up in such a fashion that "not one of the participants to the treaty and not one person in the control system would be able to injure interests of another party or to misuse power granted in accordance with the treaty". But it contradicts itself when it insists that executive power in the control organ be transferred to the hands of one person. Experience shows that there are no people who can without prejudice take a stand on one or another international event, one or another social structure. Indeed, this is not surprising because there is no one person who can live in a society and not be influenced by one or another ideology and by mutual relations which exist between different groups within society. This is why neutral countries exist, but there are not and cannot be neutral people.

It is not necessary to go far for examples and for very instructive ones. The tragedy of the Congo has clearly shown to the whole world how dangerous it is to entrust the carrying out of responsible decisions to one person. Only those who are politically blind cannot see that it is exactly with the assistance of Hammarskjöld, who pretends to be a neutral man, that colonizers have committed and are committing monstrous crimes on Congo

soil. It is no one else but Hammarskjöld who knowingly distorted in favor of colonizers decisions of the Security Council directed towards the defense of Congo national independence. With the hands of Hammarskjöld and with United Nations functionaries placed by them, colonizers are stifling liberation forces in the Congo and are making short work of Congolese patriots. Is it possible to consider the conduct of Hammarskjöld in the Congo neutral if it mocks elementary justice and protects the murderers of a great fighter for independence of the Congo, Patrice Lumumba?

No. In the Congo question, as well as in other international affairs, Hammarskjöld is not neutral although he is a representative of neutral Sweden. In fact, he was and is an executive of the policy of only one group of states and specifically of capitalist states. And after all this the United States Government is attempting to thrust a man similar to Hammarskjöld in the capacity of the single administrator in an organ which is called upon to carry out control over suspension of tests of nuclear weapons.

Of course no government which cherishes the cause of peace will desire to repeat experience with another Hammarskjöld and especially in questions which affect the most sensitive interests of the peoples—the interests of their security.

How is it possible to exclude all one-sided actions in a control body which would infringe upon legitimate interests of any states participating in the treaty? The Soviet Government asked itself such a question and on the basis of an all-sided study of this problem came to the firm conclusion that only an executive body of equal representatives of three basic groups of states can guarantee a just and objective control over fulfillment of obligations taken on themselves by states.

In objecting to equal cooperation of representatives of three basic groups of states in the main executive body of the control organization, the United States Government again maintains that such cooperation allegedly would make this organ incapable of functioning and would be equivalent to introduction of the right of "veto". Speaking about the right of "veto", it is exactly the United States Government which wishes to provide a single administrator with such a power. In reality the United States wants that person placed at the head of the control organ to determine himself whether to hold inspection of this or that event, which a state participant of the treaty demands. Thus it works out that the given administrator in reality would have the right of "veto" which not only could be used by him to slow down the conduct of inspection where it is demanded, but in general to prevent it. But to the extent that an administrator cannot be neutral, then it is impossible to suppose that his decisions would be objective. A state whose interests would be illegally infringed upon by an administrator naturally would not agree with his demands, but this in effect would paralyze control activity, making it ineffective.

Therefore a legitimate question arises—who in reality is insisting on the introduction of the right of "veto" in creation of an unworkable control organ—the Soviet Union, which proposes to create a tripartite administrative

council on the basis of equality, or the United States of America, demanding to farm out the control organ to one person who, by its calculations, must serve as a weapon of the Western Powers? In light of the above, there can be no other opinion than that the Government of the United States of America is seeking to establish such an organ, in which it would be guaranteed one-sided superiority, where the right of "veto" would prevail, the possessor of which would be the creature of one group of states, the actions of which, despite the UN and international law, as experience shows, are incompatible ideas.

The position of the Soviet Union fully excludes the possibility of any arbitrariness in the conduct of inspections. In proposals by the USSR on yearly quotas of inspections it clearly stated that within limits of an agreed quota of on-site inspections sent on the demand of opposing sides, no one—neither control commission, nor administrative council nor any other organ of the control organization—can prevent execution of the rights of states to inspection within limits of the quota, if objective indications of instruments show the presence of suspicious events.

The Soviet government and its head, N. S. Khrushchev, have repeatedly stated that the Soviet Union has not demanded and does not demand for itself a unique position or domination in the control organ. The Soviet Union asks for itself those rights which all other participants of the treaty would have.

The Government of the United States of America, in its note, points out that the United States of America in the course of almost three years has run the "risk" of refraining from carrying out tests of nuclear weapons, without having an international agreement on this question, and it cannot take upon itself this "risk" endlessly.

If the question is put this way then it is necessary to say the risk is undergone not by United States of America but by the Soviet Union. It is well known at that time when the USSR is not conducting new experimental explosions of nuclear weapons, an ally of the United States of America in the NATO military bloc, France, is conducting tests of nuclear weapons and thus has the possibility of developing this weapon in the interests also of the United States of America, which is its ally in this bloc.

Universal and full disarmament is a cardinal solution of the question which would guarantee averting a new world war. Under conditions where the Western Powers seeking one-sided military advantages have led the negotiations on cessation of tests to an impasse, it follows that the exit from the situation it is creating is to find paths of interconnected solutions both on the question of universal and full disarmament and on the question of cessation of tests of nuclear weapons. Superiority of such a solution consists in that it would remove basic obstacles which the Western Powers now see in the Soviet proposal on creation of an administrative council of three members.

As Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR N. S. Khrushchev emphasized at a meeting of the UN General Assembly, if the Western Powers accept proposals on universal and full disarmament, then the Soviet Government for its part is prepared without reservation to

accept any proposals of the Western Powers on control. Coming out against an interconnected solution of the question of suspension of nuclear tests and the problem of general and full disarmament, the Government of the United States of America gives the appearance that it does not take notice of this agreement of the Soviet Union on forms of control under conditions of carrying out universal and full disarmament proposed by the Western Powers.

One cannot but pay attention also to the reference of the Government of the United States of America in its note of June 17 that in simultaneous examination of both questions agreement on the question of suspension of tests of nuclear weapons would be postponed indefinitely, that it would be necessary to "begin all over again" etc. From these words it follows inescapably that the United States of America and its Western allies in military blocs intend to delay indefinitely conclusion of a treaty on universal and full disarmament, in this way taking upon themselves the heavy responsibility for all consequences. The Soviet Government cannot agree that negotiations on universal and full disarmament must be started all over again.

Almost two years have passed since the Soviet Union made proposals on universal and full disarmament. This problem, in the course of several months, has been discussed in detail in the Committee of Ten States on Disarmament which met last year.

The Soviet Government hoped that the new Government of the United States of America would reexamine the policy of the Eisenhower government on this question, which cannot be described as other than obstructionist. However, in the light of statements contained in the note of the United States as well as in the light of several other facts, it is forced to recognize that these hopes have not yet been justified. The Government of the USSR would like to express the hope that both great powers—the USSR and the USA—will find a common language on the problem of disarmament.

General and complete disarmament now has become a ripe historic necessity, the most reliable road to lasting peace on earth. And although the question of suspension of tests has not unimportant significance and agreement on this question would have been an important step on the path to disarmament one must be clearly aware that by itself cessation of nuclear tests could not remove the threat of atomic war and prevent an arms race. For solution of the great problem of relieving humanity of war and the burden of armaments, general and complete disarmament is necessary. It is necessary completely to destroy and liquidate the military machine of governments.

The Soviet Government agrees that successful conclusion of negotiations regarding cessation of nuclear tests would contribute to progress in other fields of disarmament and for its part has done and is doing everything possible for fulfillment of this task. However, it follows from the note of June 17 that the Government of the United States of America now wishes to use the Geneva Conference of three powers, which relates only to the question of cessation of tests of nuclear weapons, as a preliminary condition for solution of a much broader

and more important problem: general and complete disarmament. Thus on the one hand the United States Government has expended considerable effort in order to lead the Geneva Conference to an impasse and on the other hand it now makes the fate of negotiations on the problem of disarmament as a whole dependent on the outcome of negotiations at Geneva. This is a more than strange logic. It suits only those who wish to disrupt both negotiations on general and complete disarmament and negotiations on suspension of nuclear tests.

It is regrettable that the Government of the United States of America considers it appropriate in its note to stand on the slippery path of attacks against the social structure of the Soviet Union. What is this—manifestation of enmity toward Communism or an attempt to distract attention from the weakness of the position of the United States of America in disarmament questions?

The Soviet Government does not intend here to enter into discussions with the Government of the United States of America on the question of which society—socialist or capitalist—is “open” and which “closed”. The Government of the USSR proceeds from the fact that if one is to give full play to feelings which each side feels in relation to the social structure of the other side on examination of the question of disarmament, suspension of tests of nuclear weapons, and in general in the relationship of any question of interstate relations, then it follows to recognize that the basis for agreement in fact is excluded beforehand. The Soviet Government has always held this point of view and considers it the only right one. Since, however, the United States Government broached the question, it should be stated with all certainty that Soviet society is really strong and reliably closed for activities of all kinds of exploiters and oppressors growing rich off the blood and sweat of the people, closed for those who are enemies of the public and state system of the USSR. But it opens unlimited scope for the satisfaction of the needs and aspirations of the workers, who hold absolute power in the Soviet Union and are complete masters of the fruits of their labor. And for whom is American society open? It is only open for exploiters, for a handful of monopolists who direct all the strength of the government to serve their narrow interests. If anyone should give lessons in democracy to the Soviet people it should not be the government of the country the system of which is based on cruel exploitation of man by man.

If the assertions are true, which American leaders love to repeat, that in the United States all secrets are public, that the public there is fully informed about each step of the government and other official establishments, then how would the United States Government answer, for example, the questions:

Did the American people or other higher organs such as the United States of America Congress know about the provocative flights of the American U-2 planes within the borders of the USSR? Apparently they did not know until these flights were exposed, until the guilty were caught red-handed.

Perhaps it was with the approval of the American people that atomic bombs were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki? No, the American people knew nothing

about preparations for this inhumane act and, as far as it is known, condemns it.

Finally, were the American people really asked when the recent aggression against Cuba was prepared and organized from the territory of and with support of the United States? No, that was kept from the American people as a deep secret.

All these facts, apparently, easily find a place in the understanding of a “free” and “open” society as advertised in the note of the American Government, but there is no place for them within the framework of a genuinely free and genuinely open society. It has long been known that several foreign military staffs expect that the Soviet Union would open its national borders and facilitate spy activities on Soviet territory. The Governments of the Western Powers often pay tribute to the demands of these organs and support their line in international negotiations.

Is this not testified to in particular by the persistent demands of the Western Powers to expand in every way possible the number of on-site inspections, having inquired into conditions about suspension of nuclear tests on the territory of the USSR? Judging by everything, the Government of the United States is prepared to sacrifice to the interests of intelligence the interest of achieving agreement on suspension of explosions of nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Government has already repeatedly declared that it is ready to introduce for its part all control measures which will be necessary for implementing the agreement on the cessation of nuclear weapon tests. However, the Soviet Government considers it necessary to again emphasize that it will never agree that control be carried out in isolation from disarmament, and what has been represented as control over armaments which the United States is trying to achieve over a period of many years including from the platform of the United Nations.

At the same time the Soviet Union states that it itself will never agree to any disarmament measure without effective control over the implementation of these measures. The Soviet Government will not embark on disarmament without control because bitter experience has taught it not to rely upon the honest word of its Western partners to agreements.

The Soviet Government finally adheres to the views which were set forth in its aide memoire of June 4 of this year. It would hope that the Government of the United States will correctly understand the viewpoint of the Soviet Union because this will help to find a basis for achieving agreement both on the problem of general and complete disarmament, as well as on the question of suspension of tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons.

U.S.-U.K. LETTER TO U.N.

Press release 500 dated July 15

JULY 15, 1961

YOUR EXCELLENCY, On the instructions of our respective governments we have the honor to request that an item “The Urgent Need for a Treaty

to Ban Nuclear Weapons Tests Under Effective International Control" be included in the agenda of the Sixteenth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

An explanatory memorandum is attached in accordance with Rule 20 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly.

SIR PATRICK DEAN

Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom to the United Nations.

FRANCIS T. P. PLIMPTON

Deputy Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations.

THE URGENT NEED FOR A TREATY TO BAN NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTS UNDER EFFECTIVE INTERNATIONAL CONTROL

1. In its past six sessions, the General Assembly has given serious consideration to the problem of cessation of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons tests. In a number of resolutions—the last of which was adopted on December 20, 1960—the Assembly has recognized the imperative and urgent need for agreement by treaty on such a ban. To this end, it has urged the three States negotiating in Geneva to make every effort to achieve such agreement under conditions of appropriate international control. At the same time, while negotiations were in progress, the General Assembly urged the negotiating States to refrain voluntarily from the testing of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons.

2. The United States and the United Kingdom Government are conscious of their responsibility before the international community and of the importance of a test ban agreement to general world peace and security. For these reasons they have negotiated patiently with the Soviet Union in Geneva for nearly three years to achieve a ban on nuclear weapons tests which would be open for adherence by all States. For these reasons they have refrained from conducting nuclear and thermonuclear tests since negotiations commenced in October 1958. During all this period, however, there has been no international verification to ensure that no clandestine nuclear weapons tests are being conducted by any nation. The Soviet Union has steadfastly resisted the adoption of key measures of international control which alone could afford a reasonable degree of assurance to all States that the parties to a treaty are adhering to their obligations. It must be recognized that the voluntary forbearance of the United States and the United Kingdom to conduct nuclear weapons tests, under such conditions, involves a serious risk to their security.

3. In keeping with General Assembly resolution 1578 (XV) of December 20, 1960, the United States and the United Kingdom introduced at Geneva on March 21 and May 29 of this year, a large number of far-reaching compromise proposals dealing with the principal issues unresolved between them and the Soviet Union. These proposals would not only give the Soviet Union and states

associated with it a position of absolute equality with the United States, the United Kingdom and states associated with them on the policy-making control commission, and throughout the control system; they would also go as far as possible, consistent with the technical and organizational requirements of effective control, to accommodate Soviet sensitivities on the subject of control. Moreover, the United States and the United Kingdom introduced on April 18, 1961 a complete compromise treaty text which they are prepared to sign immediately or to use as a basis for further serious negotiation. A copy of this treaty was circulated to the members of the United Nations on June 3.

4. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, did not heed the counsel of the General Assembly "to make every effort to reach agreement as soon as possible." It has failed to respond constructively to the initiative of its two negotiating partners. It has not introduced a single positive proposal within the past year and a half. Instead, since March 21, the Soviet Union has retreated from agreements already reached. Its most significant backward step was a new proposal that day-by-day executive authority over the international control system be exercised by a three-member administrative council (including representatives of the two nuclear sides and a neutral representative) which could act only by unanimous consent. This proposal retracted the Soviet Union's earlier agreement on a single administrator, who would be appointed with the concurrence of the Soviet Union, who would carry out the directives of the treaty and of the policy-making control commission, and who would be responsible to and operate under, the supervision of the control commission. While such a single administrator could take action rapidly and impartially, under the three-man administrative council proposal any action could be blocked, or delayed by any of its members.

The Soviet Union justifies its proposal for a three-member administrative council by asserting that "There is no one person who can live in a society and not be influenced by one or another ideology and by mutual relations which exist between different groups within society. Neutral countries exist, but there are not and cannot be neutral people."

The United States and United Kingdom Governments categorically repudiate any suggestion that there are no people capable of exercising independent judgment on behalf of the international community. Indeed, the whole history of international organizations bears witness to the contrary. The two Governments believe that the Soviet rejection of the idea of an international civil servant acting impartially under guidance from international policy-making organs can only be viewed as an attack upon the executive capacity of any international organization to act effectively.

The United States and the United Kingdom reject the Soviet proposal for the appointment of three-man committees, composed of representatives of states or of supposed blocs of states, in which all action would have to be taken by unanimous consent of all three—a further opportunity to add to the many individual vetoes the Soviet has cast in world affairs during the post-war period.

They are convinced that all nations which do not wish the domination of great powers will likewise reject it.

The Soviet Union's position is further based on other inadequacies which frustrate the concept of effective international control. Chief among these are: (a) the determination to limit inspection of suspicious events in the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union to three annually; (b) the demand for a delay of four years after treaty ratification before control operations could begin; and (c) insistence on provisions permitting self inspection, for example by turning over direction of all control posts and inspection teams in the Soviet Union to nationals of the Soviet Union. Moreover, in introducing the specious contention that the control arrangements proposed by the United States and the United Kingdom could be misused for espionage purposes, the Soviet Union has not only overlooked the far-reaching safeguards built into these arrangements to obviate any such danger, but has also, in effect, repudiated a control system of the scope recommended by the Geneva Conference of Experts in August 1958.

5. Confirming its unwillingness to comply with the numerous General Assembly resolutions urging early agreement on a nuclear weapons test ban, the Soviet Union now dismisses the significance of a separate treaty. It proposes instead that a treaty banning nuclear weapons tests should await agreement on, and perhaps indeed implementation of, general and complete disarmament. This proposal reverses the Soviet Union's earlier position; it can only be concluded that this is being done in order to avoid any commitment now on a nuclear weapons test ban to which all states could accede. The United States and the United Kingdom are opposed to delaying a test ban treaty until agreement on total disarmament can be worked out. The Geneva Conference has shown that a treaty under reasonable and effective international controls is possible; before the Soviet Union started reversing its positions, the Conference had such a treaty well within its reach. The United States and the United Kingdom believe that the progress made in nearly three years of negotiation should not be given up, but that efforts should continue until an agreement has been reached. They believe that an adequately controlled nuclear weapons test ban agreement concluded at an early time would be of inestimable value for (a) halting dangerous proliferation in nuclear weapon capabilities; (b) eliminating forever concern over fallout; (c) providing an agreed first step toward controlled disarmament; and (d) generally commencing a process which could build confidence among nations and decrease the danger of war.

6. The present attitude of the Soviet Union, as underlined by recent notes of its Government, does nothing to narrow differences between the two sides; indeed, it has enlarged them. Consequently, a serious impasse has been reached. Recognizing the importance of these negotiations to the security and peace of the international community, the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom believe that the General Assembly should consider at its sixteenth session the critical situation that now confronts the conference. The two Governments are prepared to present a full exposition of their performance in carrying out the General Assembly mandate. It

is the hope of both Governments that a treaty for cessation of nuclear weapons tests under adequate international control may yet be achieved and they stand ready to continue negotiations at Geneva to this end. The importance of such an agreement as a first step in reversing the dangerous and burdensome arms race can hardly be overestimated. The nations of the world must take this opportunity of taking a first significant step toward enduring world peace.

Assistant Secretary Williams Plans Second Trip to Africa

Press release 495 dated July 14

G. Mennen Williams, Assistant Secretary for African Affairs, will visit several southern African countries and the Malagasy Republic during August. This will be Mr. Williams' second trip to Africa since he was named by President Kennedy to his present position in the Department of State. He visited 16 countries in middle Africa between February 15 and March 18 this year.¹

In August Mr. Williams will visit Angola, Basutoland, Bechuanaland, Swaziland, Mozambique, the Malagasy Republic, and the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland. En route he will attend the independence celebrations of the Ivory Coast at Abidjan August 6 and 7. He will be accompanied by Mrs. Williams.

The purpose of the trip is to convey to the governments and peoples of southern Africa and Madagascar the good wishes and interest of the United States and to gain firsthand impressions of the countries visited. He will also look into the status of our embassies and consulates and will seek opportunities to meet with American educators, businessmen, and missionaries.

Before beginning his August trip, Mr. Williams will attend a regional conference of U.S. Chiefs of Mission, to be held at Lagos, Nigeria. He will leave for Lagos on July 19.

It had been hoped that Mr. Williams could visit the Republic of South Africa in August. Upon inquiry, however, the Government of the Republic of South Africa indicated that a later date would be more convenient.

Mr. Williams will visit other countries of Africa during the present calendar year.

¹ For an address by Mr. Williams on Mar. 24, 1961, dealing with the first trip, see BULLETIN of Apr. 10, 1961, p. 527.

New Learning Processes for Developing Nations

Remarks by Philip H. Coombs

Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs¹

It is my privilege to welcome you here on behalf of the Department of State, to thank you for your help in a most important endeavor, to congratulate the American Council on Education and the ICA [International Cooperation Administration] for their initiative, and to wish you great success.

This Conference on New Learning Processes for Developing Nations is very timely and has the potential of becoming a landmark in international educational cooperation.

Great importance is attached to this topic in Washington today. President Kennedy and Secretary Rusk at the very outset of the new administration took steps to give greater emphasis and prominence to educational and cultural affairs as a major component of U.S. foreign relations. One result is that for the first time there is now a central point in the executive branch where responsibility resides for providing policy guidance and stimulation, integration, and coordination of all Federal activities bearing upon international educational and cultural affairs. This responsibility extends also to insuring effective liaison and cooperation between the Federal Government and the academic community and private organizations with respect to international educational affairs.

As the person first entrusted with these new responsibilities, I want to express briefly my personal conviction that education stands on the verge of two major breakthroughs in the international field.

The first is a breakthrough of scale and importance. Education will become in the sixties a stronger force than ever before for accelerating economic growth and social advancement, particularly in less developed nations but in more developed ones as well.

New Recognition of Educational Needs

Here and abroad there has lately been a new recognition of the fundamental importance of human resource development—and hence of educational development—to the total process of nation building, economic growth, social justice, and general advancement toward truly free and independent societies.

President Kennedy has called for increased emphasis upon the development of human resources as one of the hallmarks of our new foreign assistance program.² This emphasis we can advocate with deep conviction. The history of our own young country provides a classic demonstration of how educational opportunity for a whole population undergirds economic growth and democratic social development. There can be no dispute that, in the absence of past heavy investment in popular education for all its people, the United States could not today have its present productive strength or world leadership position.

We Americans have lately been paying more attention to this important lesson of our own history, and so have others. It was reflected in the Act of Bogotá³ last year and even more ex-

¹ Made before the Conference on New Learning Processes for Developing Nations at the American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., on July 10 (press release 488 dated July 11).

² For the President's message to the Congress on foreign aid, see *BULLETIN* of Apr. 10, 1961, p. 507.

³ For text, see *ibid.*, Oct. 3, 1960, p. 537.

publicly in the UNESCO [United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization] conference on African educational development at Addis Ababa just a few weeks ago.⁴ At the latter conference educational leaders and economists from many nations joined in proclaiming that "education is a good investment." They meant this literally—that the "yield" on educational expenditures measured in national economic output, the yield on a nation's investment in its *people*, is at least as great as the yield on investment in *things*, such as factories, highways, and natural resources. It is to be hoped that those responsible for making international loans will take heed of these findings by eminent economists. In addition to the economic payoff, of course, educational investment yields other important returns in the form of social development and individual self-realization.

It is heartening that in the past few years outstanding economists in Europe and the United States have turned their attention to examining the "education industry," its contribution to economic growth, its need for more resources and for more efficient use of available educational resources. Happily one such economist is now chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers—Dr. Walter Heller. Another, Dr. [Thor] Kristensen of Denmark, recently became Secretary General of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, and there are others in high places.

The new insights which these and other prominent economists have uncovered—such as Seymour Harris of Harvard, Theodore Schultz of Chicago, Frederick Harbison of Princeton, and others on both sides of the Atlantic—will be brought into focus at Brookings Institution here in Washington this October when the new Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (successor to the OEEC) holds its first meeting in the United States. This meeting will bring together top policymakers in financial and educational affairs from several nations to discuss "The Relationship of Educational Investment to Economic Growth." It is inconceivable that such a meeting on such a topic could have been held only a few years ago.

These are among the reasons why I feel con-

⁴For text of remarks made by Mr. Coombs at the conference, see *ibid.*, June 12, 1961, p. 936.

fident that education stands on the verge of a breakthrough of scale and importance in world affairs.

Breakthrough in Educational Technology

But there is a second kind of educational breakthrough at hand, one which you who are assembled here are challenged to help design and bring about. It is a breakthrough of educational technology which the whole world, but especially the less developed nations, urgently need and await.

Twentieth century needs can no more be met with 18th and 19th century technology in the field of education than in agriculture, industry, communications, the military, or any other major field of human endeavor. Yet it is only a slight exaggeration to say that this is exactly what we have been trying to get away with in education.

There is obviously much that is good in our conventional methods of teaching and learning, and in our curriculums, that should be carried forward. But there is also a vast amount that is obsolete and should be replaced with something better. Relative to the great advances of knowledge in many fields the curriculum is seriously obsolete. And relative to what we have learned about learning and relative to new technologies of communication and instruction now available, our educational methods, logistics, and organization are seriously obsolete. To defend this outmoded technology as if it were a theology and to seek to export it to new countries in the name of "sound education" and "good quality standards" would be academic criminal negligence.

I am firmly convinced that the nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America who are striving toward viable independence and a free and fuller life for their people will never make it if, with every good intention and with encouragement from others like ourselves, they pour their limited resources into simply expanding a carbon copy of some other nation's obsolete curriculum and teaching methods. It will not fit their needs, and it certainly will not fit their pocketbooks, even when supplemented by our resources.

Any doubt about the validity of this somber proposition was dispelled at the recent Addis Ababa conference. A systematic effort was made there by educators and economists to calculate the approximate economic requirements for achieving relatively modest educational expansion goals 20

years from now. These illustrative goals for sub-Saharan Africa called for having 100 percent of young boys and girls in elementary school by 1980, 20 percent of the age group in some sort of secondary school, and only 2 percent of the age group in higher education (compared to nearly 40 percent in the United States at present). To reach these goals with conventional technology, it was estimated, would require an annual growth rate in the national economies of 4 percent over the next 5 years and 6 percent a year thereafter (which even optimistic economists find hard to assume) and about a doubling of the present percentage of the gross national product expended on education. Even with these rather heroic economic assumptions, there would be a large educational deficit to be met by external assistance, reaching a peak of \$1 billion by 1970, or roughly 10 times last year's level.

Even if all this money for education could be secured in the face of strong competing demands, the result could be a hollow and frustrating achievement—a dramatic expansion of the forms and rituals of education without much substance of quality, basically because of an inevitable shortage of good quality teachers to staff the schools in conventional fashion.

It seems certain, therefore, that "conventional wisdom" applied to educational expansion in the developing countries will lead at best to disappointment and frustration and at worst to disaster.

Closing the Gap Between Performance and Needs

Then what is the alternative? What can we and other advanced nations do to help developing nations—and no less ourselves—to close the great gap between present educational performance and rapidly mounting educational needs?

We can apply *unconventional* wisdom, ingenuity, professional courage, and imaginative brainpower, just as we have done in other major fields of human endeavor when history called for great breakthroughs. Our educational institutions have in the past advanced the well-being of mankind by hatching scientific and technological revolutions of agriculture, industry, medicine, communications, and space. History calls for a technological revolution of education itself. It is overdue, and there is no time to waste.

There will be those, as always, who will resist innovations in education, who will warn against

the threat to quality, the dehumanization of learning, the danger of using children as guinea pigs, and the like. Some will secretly fear technological unemployment. Still others, on the extreme, will want to save the world of education with a simple panacea, usually this gimmick or that gadget.

That there are risks cannot be denied, but the greatest risk of all would be to stand pat on the *status quo*. Gimmicks and gadgets will no doubt play an important role, but no one of them alone will do the trick. And there surely always remains a large role for the teacher—and for close personal relations between student and teacher.

What is needed is the development of new *systems* of instruction and learning, involving combinations of mechanical and human inputs, geared to producing clearly defined learning results. Far from dehumanizing education, such new combinations can release human potentials which heretofore have been wasted.

One final word as to how this necessary revolution of educational technology can best be brought about. I am convinced that it will not be achieved simply by spending more money on educational research of the conventional variety. It will require, I suspect, at least three things: (1) the careful defining of specific "targets"—problems to be solved, such as illiteracy, and learning goals to be achieved; (2) the mobilization of imaginative brainpower from a variety of fields, not simply education but such fields as psychology, sociology and anthropology, physics and mathematics, electronics engineering, and wherever else dedicated and imaginative brainpower can be found; and (3) the application of the philosophy and techniques of "research and development" rather than the traditional approach of educational research.

Perhaps we will have to invent and organize new types of institutions to do all this. I suspect, for example, that education has much to learn from agriculture, where man-hour productivity has risen more in the last 10 years than in industry. Perhaps we need a new type of research and development institution and related extension service which will do for education what the agricultural experiment station has done for agriculture. The latter set out in a systematic way, for example, to get rid of the boll weevil and did very well. Education has plenty of boll weevils to eliminate.

I have sought in these introductory remarks to

suggest a broad frame of reference for your pursuits of the next 3 days. The worldwide breakthroughs in education are yours to make. And your even larger frame of reference is defined by the great revolutionary forces that have converged in our time and by the hopes and aspirations of mankind in every nation on earth, slave and free alike. The stakes for education have never been greater, and your efforts, I feel sure, will not be in vain.

U.S. To Help Brazil Develop Economy of Northeast Area

Statement by President Kennedy¹

No area in this hemisphere is in greater or more urgent need of attention than Brazil's vast northeast. Covering more than 600,000 square miles and containing almost 25 million people, northeast Brazil is one of South America's most crowded and poverty-stricken regions. The average per capita income barely reaches \$100; in 18 northeastern cities infant mortality is between 25 and 35 percent, and the area as a whole suffers from overpopulation, recurrent drought, food shortages, and high illiteracy. To these problems is added a yearly population increase of 600,000.

This area, with its poverty, hunger, and consequent discontent, is a crucible of social, economic, political problems—problems which have unmistakable implications for the future development of Brazil and the security of the entire hemisphere.

To study cooperative methods of dealing with these problems the United States invited Dr. Celso Furtado, Director of the Development Agency for Northeast Brazil (SUDENE), to come to Washington and review projected plans for the development of the northeast. Dr. Furtado has prepared—through the agency of SUDENE—a 5-year plan for the northeast, designed to reconstruct the economy of that area and bring hope for a better life to its people. The plan is the result of 2 years' study and has the firm support of

President [Janio] Quadros and the Brazilian Congress.

The plan envisages a total cost of \$900 million over a 5-year period; \$500 million to be supplied by the Brazilians, and \$126 million by international institutions such as the Inter-American Bank or IDA [International Development Association]. Of the remainder, the plan permits providing almost half through the supply of surplus foodstuffs. High officials of the United States Government—in meetings chaired by Milton Barall of the Department of State—have spent this week in preliminary discussions of the program with Dr. Furtado.

Certainly a plan of this magnitude, with its wealth of technical detail, will require a great deal of further study. And the United States intends to dispatch a group of economists and technicians to Brazil to participate with SUDENE in such studies. However, although the details of the plan and the magnitude of resources involved need further examination, the overall objectives of SUDENE appear to be substantially sound, realistic, and in harmony with those of the Alliance for Progress, which itself is an outgrowth of the Brazilian concept of Operation Pan America.²

Therefore, the United States is prepared to cooperate with SUDENE to help it realize the objectives embodied in this program. Together the United States and Brazil will work with international agencies and other Western nations in an effort to mobilize the external resources which may be necessary. The United States is prepared to cooperate with SUDENE, on a continuing basis, to help solve the problems of the northeast and to bring economic and social progress to that hard-pressed region.

The Governments of Brazil and the United States have already cooperated in providing a great deal of assistance to northeast Brazil, just as we have cooperated in providing substantial assistance this year to the entire country. And the ICA [International Cooperation Administration], on request by the Brazilian Government, is prepared to immediately provide technicians for research and technical assistance in river valley development, soil utilization, water supply, basic

¹ Made on July 14 (White House press release) following a meeting with Celso Furtado, Director of SUDENE, the Brazilian Government agency for development of northeast Brazil. For an announcement of Dr. Furtado's visit, see BULLETIN of July 24, 1961, p. 140.

² For background, see *ibid.*, June 30, 1958, p. 1090; Oct. 13, 1958, p. 574; and Apr. 3, 1961, p. 471.

education, and other fields to which SUDENE is giving priority attention.

In the course of Dr. Furtado's visit we have concluded initial agreements for the supply, as part of the Food-for-Peace Program, of grain and lard as an emergency reserve for flood or drought. In addition, food will be used to aid the resettlement of emigrants from the northeast area. Negotiations are also continuing for the donation of U.S. foodstuffs to be used as partial wages in connection with economic development projects.

The visit of Dr. Furtado has helped to increase our understanding of the problems of northeast Brazil. The systematic study, planning, and concern which the Government of Brazil has devoted to the area holds high promise for the betterment of the living conditions of its 25 million people. And the United States intends to play a continuing role in helping our sister Republic of Brazil meet this urgent challenge.

United States and Soviet Union Begin Air Transport Talks

The Department of State announced on July 15 (press release 499) that negotiations between the Government of the United States and the Soviet Union concerning the establishment of reciprocal commercial air services between New York and Moscow would begin at Washington on July 18. James M. Landis, Special Assistant to the President, is chairman of the U.S. delegation. Other members of the U.S. delegation are:

Edward A. Bolster, *vice chairman*, Director, Office of Transport and Communications, Department of State
Carroll E. Cobb, Aviation Division, Department of State
Edward L. Killham, Office of Soviet Union Affairs, Department of State

Chan Gurney, Member, Civil Aeronautics Board

Joseph C. Watson, Director, Bureau of International Affairs, Civil Aeronautics Board

Raymond B. Maloy, Director, International Aviation Service, Federal Aviation Agency

C. D. Martin, Jr., Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation

Edward J. Driscoll, Deputy for Transportation and Communications to Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Materiel)

Russell B. Adams, vice president of Pan American World Airways, will attend as observer.

Col. Gen. Yevgeni F. Loginov, Chief of the Main Administration of the Civil Air Fleet attached to the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R.,

is to head the Soviet delegation. Other members of the Soviet delegation will be:

V. M. Danilychev

S. K. Ermin

K. T. Logvinov

V. S. Gryaznov

A. V. Lebdev

S. S. Pavlov

G. V. Voitsekhovich

A. K. Startsev

Aviation Discussions Concluded by U.S. and Netherlands

Press release 493 dated July 13

Aviation delegations representing the United States and the Netherlands concluded discussions on July 12 concerning the Netherlands' desire for a route to the United States West Coast and the United States' desire for the resolution of certain problems concerning the interpretation of the United States-Netherlands Air Transport Agreement¹ and the application of the capacity provisions thereof to the operations of the respective carriers.

In discussions between representatives of the respective delegations, a full and frank exchange of views was undertaken in a friendly and cordial atmosphere. Although progress was made in narrowing the area of disagreement, it proved impossible to reach an understanding on all of the outstanding issues. The Netherlands delegation has returned to the Netherlands.

Prime Minister of Nigeria To Visit United States

The Department of State announced on July 11 (press release 486) that arrangements are being completed for the visit to the United States from July 24 to August 1 of Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, Prime Minister of the Federation of Nigeria. The Prime Minister will make an official visit at the invitation of President Kennedy. Following a brief stay in New York City, he will arrive at Washington on July 25. After his stay in Washington, the Prime Minister will visit Chicago, Knoxville, and New York City.

¹ For text, see BULLETIN of May 6, 1957, p. 747.

Department Presents Views on Bill To Promote U.S. Foreign Commerce

Press release 489 dated July 11

Deputy Under Secretary of State Roger W. Jones appeared before the Senate Committee on Commerce on July 11 to present the Department's views on S. 1729, "To promote the foreign commerce of the United States, and for related purposes." Following is the Department's report on the bill which was distributed to the committee and which formed the basis for Deputy Under Secretary Jones' remarks.

JULY 9, 1961

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your letter of May 8, 1961,¹ which was acknowledged on May 9,² invited comments by the Department on S. 1729, a bill "To promote the foreign commerce of the United States, and for related purposes." The Department appreciates the opportunity to express its views on this proposed legislation.

To accomplish its stated purpose, the bill proposes the following principal lines of action: First, it would authorize a number of specific measures to be undertaken by the Department of Commerce and by our commercial attachés abroad in order to improve the export promotion services which the Government offers to American businessmen seeking to develop export markets; second, it would provide a link for the Small Business Administration to participate through the Department of Commerce in promotion of export trade; third, it would establish a separate commercial service by transferring our commercial attachés and officers abroad from the operational jurisdiction of the Department of State to the Department of Commerce; fourth, it would authorize the Export-Import Bank to provide a system of export credit insurance to guarantee against commercial as well as political risks.

The Department of State is in accord with the primary objective of this bill and attaches great importance to its role and that of the Foreign Service of the United States in furthering our

commercial interests abroad. The Department subscribes fully to the statement of policy in the bill:

It is the sense of the Congress that the peace and economic well-being of the peoples of the world increasingly depends on wider recognition, both in principle and practice, of the interdependence of men upon an expanding exchange of goods and services. The Congress finds and declares that foreign trade represents a strong and vital element in the economic leadership of the United States among free nations.

This statement supports the Department's desire to balance our international payments through positive measures to promote exports, rather than through restrictions on trade and payments which would negate the favorable results and progress made under our postwar economic and trade policies. Moreover, the maintenance of a substantial trade surplus is related to our capability to continue programs abroad considered essential to our national interests.

As the Committee will recall, the Department of State in early 1960 participated with the Department of Commerce and other Government agencies in planning and undertaking an extensive Export Expansion Program.³ This program is being carried out with vigor. Indeed, several of the provisions of S. 1729 refer to improvements in our trade promotion services which were specifically included in this program and already are in effect.

Considerable improvement was achieved in our foreign trade last year, although the world competitive situation gives us no reason to lessen our efforts. In 1960 exports reached an all-time record of \$19.4 billion, an increase of twenty percent over the previous year, and our export surplus was \$4.7 billion, one of the largest in history. This was in part the result of successful negotiating efforts by our ambassadors, together with our economic and commercial officers, working in a unified operation to obtain relaxation of import restrictions against dollar goods. The increased emphasis and priority accorded to trade promotion by the Foreign Service contributed to this achievement.

¹ Not printed.

² For background, see BULLETIN of Apr. 11, 1960, p. 560.

The Department therefore favors those provisions in this bill which it believes would support and expand upon measures initiated under the Export Expansion Program. The proposals in Title I for expanded export promotion services generally fall in this category. For example, Section 101(2), which would authorize an expansion in the number and variety of services provided by commercial attachés abroad, is in direct line with our present efforts. The proposal in paragraph (9) of this section for contracting with private firms to undertake market surveys is one which the Department has advocated. The Department recommends, however, that references to the "Foreign Commerce Corps" be deleted in Title I and that the "Foreign Service of the United States of America" be substituted therefor. With regard to the other provisions in Title I, the Department endorses them, but defers to the Department of Commerce for comments on provisions of primary concern to that Department.

Similarly, the proposals in Title II concerning the Small Business Administration are of primary concern to other agencies with one exception: Section 201(a)(4) provides legislative authorization for the Small Business Administration to be represented at international commercial treaty and trade negotiations and related interagency committees. This provision does not appear to be necessary inasmuch as no special legislative authorization would be required to achieve the stated purpose.

Title III of the bill would establish under the Department of Commerce a separate service abroad to be known as the "Foreign Commerce Corps of the United States." The Department of State opposes this proposal.

As the Committee is aware, the proposal to establish a separate commercial service abroad is not new. Such a service existed in the era before 1939 but was discarded in recognition of the increasing interdependence of political, economic, and commercial matters in foreign affairs, and the cross-purposes that developed in operating separate services abroad for these closely related functions. The issue of a separate service was raised a year ago when this Department furnished your Committee with its considered views on the subject under cover of a letter of May 6, 1960,³ from the

³ Not printed.

Honorable Douglas Dillon, Acting Secretary of State. It was then dismissed as being untimely even by some proponents of a separate service, because it was deemed better to improve our existing machinery than to entail the risk, confusion and problems in setting up a new and separate service. This situation still obtains and has been reinforced by the emphasis which the President has placed in enlarging foreign markets for American goods and services through the provision of added commercial representatives and facilities abroad. Furthermore, the Departments of State and Commerce have been cooperating in developing specific plans to carry out the President's instructions through a series of steps to improve the quality of commercial activities carried on through the Foreign Service Officer Corps. To this end, the Departments have established a joint task force, supported by technical working teams, which will concentrate on the problems to which Secretary Hodges will refer in his report to the Committee. Under these circumstances and in the belief that we can accomplish the objectives of Title III promptly and effectively, the Department strongly recommends that this title be dropped from the bill.

With respect to the remaining substantive titles in this bill, the Department favors the objective of Title IV to increase the Export-Import Bank's authority for export promotion purposes, but defers to the Export-Import Bank for comment on the adequacy of the bill to further these purposes. While the Department has no objection to the proposal in Title V for utilizing local currencies generated under Public Law 480 for financing export promotion programs in foreign countries, it is our understanding that the Treasury Department questions this provision.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this report for the consideration of the Committee.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK

The Honorable
WARREN G. MAGNUSON, *Chairman,*
Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate.

President Proposes Amendments to 1962 Foreign Aid Budget

White House press release dated July 6

The President sent to Congress on July 6 amendments to the 1962 budget to carry out his recommendations for an expanded foreign assistance program.¹ The amendments provide \$3,575,500,000 in appropriations. In addition, a request for \$900,000,000 in borrowing authority for the Agency for International Development is now pending before Congress in authorizing legislation.

Excluding a request for \$59,500,000 for the Peace Corps and other activities, to be transmitted later, the President's foreign assistance program totals \$4,475,000,000. The original budget request was \$4,000,000,000.

At the same time, the President proposed an increase of \$260,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses for the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

The specific amendments follow:

Agency for International Development

The original budget request of \$2,200,000,000 for mutual security economic programs is decreased to \$1,690,500,000 to reflect the new AID program developed by the President's Task Force on Foreign Economic Assistance, for which authorization has already been requested. The revised estimate reflects the elimination from the appropriation request of \$700,000,000 for the Development Loan Fund due to the financing of development lending through borrowing authority included in the authorizing legislation. The request for other economic assistance is reduced by \$59,500,000 as a result of the decision to finance the Peace Corps separately and to finance refugees and certain administrative expenses in the State Department rather than in the Agency for International Development. These decreases are partially offset by an increase of \$250,000,000 in the contingency fund.

Military Assistance

The original estimate of \$1,800,000,000 for military assistance is increased to \$1,885,000,000 to

¹ For text of President Kennedy's foreign aid message of Mar. 22, 1961, see BULLETIN of Apr. 10, 1961, p. 507.

reflect a more precise evaluation of requirements arising out of international developments since the preparation of the budget document. The major increases are for southeast Asia and Latin America.

Export-Import Bank of Washington

The limitation of \$2,750,000 on administrative expenses of the Export-Import Bank is increased to \$3,010,000 to reflect the additional expenses required to undertake a comprehensive exporter credit guaranty program equivalent to the program now provided foreign exporters by many European countries. The new program would insure repayment against both political and commercial risks.

Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy

87th Congress, 1st Session

Free Importation of Wild Birds and Wild Animals. Report to accompany H.R. 7678. H. Rept. 580. June 26, 1961. 2 pp.

Free Entry of Electron Microscopes. Report to accompany H.R. 3385. S. Rept. 482. June 29, 1961. 2 pp.

Temporary Reduction in Duty-Free Allowance for Returning Residents. Report to accompany H.R. 6611. S. Rept. 483. June 29, 1961. 4 pp.

United States Contribution to the Food and Agriculture Organization. Hearing before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. May 24, 1961. 27 pp.

The International Development and Security Act. Hearings before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on H.R. 7372, a bill to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world in their efforts toward economic and social development and internal and external security. Part I. June 7-16, 1961. 450 pp.

Inter-American Cultural and Scientific Interchange Program. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. June 17, 1961. 27 pp.

Duty-Free Allowance of Returning Residents. Hearings before the Senate Committee on Finance on H.R. 6611, an act to amend paragraph 1798(c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 to reduce temporarily the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents. June 22-23, 1961. 122 pp.

The United States and World Trade: Challenges and Opportunities. Final report of the Senate Commerce Committee prepared by its special staff on the study of U.S. foreign commerce. S. Rept. 446. June 26, 1961. 309 pp.

Amendments Involving a Decrease for the Agency for International Development, an Increase for Military Assistance, and an Increase in Limitation on Administrative Expenses for the Export-Import Bank of Washington. Communication from the President transmitting amendments to the budget for fiscal year 1962. H. Doc. 208. July 6, 1961. 4 pp.

The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands

Following are statements made in the U.N. Trusteeship Council by M. Wilfred Goding, High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and U.S. Special Representative in the Trusteeship Council, and Tosiwo Nakayama, Adviser to the U.S. Special Representative.

OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. GODING, JUNE 13

U.S./U.N. press release 3751

It is a privilege to appear before this body as the Special Representative of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. This is the first time that I have had the honor of serving in this capacity, and I look forward to receiving the comments and suggestions of this body.

On May 1 of this year I was appointed High Commissioner of the Trust Territory, and my tenure in the territory, thus, has been very brief. I have, however, visited four of the districts and have had the opportunity to observe firsthand district-level problems and needs. The Administering Authority also has designated Mr. [Delmas H.] Nucker, the former High Commissioner,¹ who is well known to the Council, to serve with me as a second Special Representative for this session, and with your permission I will be referring to him questions on past events and programs with which I may not be familiar in detail. For my part I shall endeavor to the best of my ability to amplify or clarify any questions on present and proposed programs.

This year's review by this Council has several important and significant features. A new national administration has come into being in the United States, and a new High Commissioner has been appointed for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The Council also has before it for review the comprehensive report of the 1961

visiting mission² in addition to our annual report.³ The combination of these factors gives our administration a unique opportunity to review accomplishments of the past 10 years, to reassess needs, and to plan programs for the future.

The visiting mission was the fifth mission to inspect the territory. It was also the first to devote its attention exclusively to our territory. Accordingly the mission was able to spend approximately twice the time in our area than had any other previous mission. This enabled the members to visit more areas, to hold more conferences with the staff and local Micronesian groups, and to conduct more public meetings. It afforded them the opportunity to delve deeply into specific problems. The mission penetrated into village areas near district centers, where shortness of time previously had prevented visits. Equally important, the mission was able to visit more out-islands than any previous mission. The travels of the mission by plane, by motorboat, by outrigger canoe, by jeep, and by foot—and, I am told, on one memorable occasion by swimming on the part of at least one member—brought to the members, perhaps more than to any previous mission, an appreciation of the many difficulties imposed by our peculiar logistic system, our extremely limited natural resources, and the differences in language and custom which exist throughout the territory. The 1961 mission had an unparalleled opportunity to participate firsthand in the unique difficulties which confront us in trying to handle the many phases of social, economic, and political development. The mission performed its task conscientiously, ably, and with great devotion. On behalf of the Administering Authority I wish to thank the members of the mission for their valuable re-

¹ U.N. doc. T/1560.

² *Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1960* (Department of State Publication 7183); for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. (\$1).

³ For a review of the previous year by Mr. Nucker, see *BULLETIN* of June 27, 1960, p. 1036.

port and to assure the Council that the recommendations will be studied with care and given every consideration.

Since our annual report and the visiting mission report provide the Council with much detail on specific programs, I propose today to sketch only the highlights of our major activities since last June 30, 1960, up to the present time.

Political Development

Significant progress has been made on all levels in the field of political development.

The fifth annual meeting of the Inter-District Advisory Committee met last August to consider problems of common interest in the territory. A holdover subcommittee on economic development was elected and given the task of visiting all districts to study problems of economic development, and the committee has done so. Its report, along with that of the social development subcommittee—both excellent reports—will be important agenda items at the forthcoming inter-district conference this summer. This year it is proposed that the interdistrict conference elect a third holdover subcommittee—on political development—to work on common problems in the political field. Thus three subcommittees dealing with major areas of interest will be available during the year to advise the High Commissioner's office.

Two events of note concerning the Inter-District Advisory Committee might be mentioned.

At its spring session the Palau District Congress passed a bill calling for popular election of the interdistrict delegates rather than election by the Congress, as is now the case. This bill is still in committee, but I propose to approve it when it is submitted and further intend to call it to the attention of the other district congresses for their consideration.

At the meeting next September Saipan District will send two full-fledged delegates, rather than an observer as has been the case in the past.

Both these events, we believe, will aid in developing more of a territory-wide consciousness among the people of the districts.

By the end of the next year all delegates to the interdistrict body should be elected at large from their respective districts. One of the main tasks of the proposed subcommittee on political development will be to work out plans, in collab-

oration with district leaders, for conversion of the present Inter-District Committee into a Territorial Council. We envision, if the present rate of political growth and progress continues, that by 1965 we should have a territorial legislative council in existence.

Political development on a district level has been most satisfactory. The spring sessions of the various district congresses have just been concluded, and they were, in our estimation, the most successful to date. Palau Congress, for example, sat in session twice as long as at any prior session and thus was able to devote more time to study of the bills before them. The visiting mission had an opportunity to meet with representatives of the district congresses in all districts, and the members will attest, I am certain, to the sincerity and concern of these district congresses to the problems of their respective districts.

On a municipal level work continued on the formal chartering program. Since the establishment in 1959 of the target of chartering all municipalities, 43 have been chartered and our goal of chartering on an average of 10 municipalities a year has been realized to date. The municipalities closest and most accessible to the district center have been chartered first. Palau and Ponape Districts now have each chartered all but one of their municipalities. The Marshalls, Truk, and Yap Districts, which have isolated out-island municipalities, are now beginning to move out into the remote areas with teams of political development workers. Increasing emphasis will be placed this coming year on training of local political development teams for this phase of local political development. There is an increasing awareness amongst the inhabitants of common political interests. It is our intention to foster and encourage all steps which will aid in increasing and solidifying this consciousness. One such step I propose to take this coming year is to add a political affairs officer to my staff.

Administration

Among the major events of general administrative significance during the past year were a number of interrelated changes concerning the Micronesian Title and Pay Plan. These consisted of the institution of an approximate overall pay raise of 10 percent for all employees, the establishment of a longevity wage schedule, and the estab-

lishment of a senior professional and executive category with a special wage schedule designed to compensate adequately the Micronesians who qualify for these top positions. A very recent change was the institution of an annual salary pattern for these senior professional and executive employees in place of the former hourly wage system. This change was the direct result of an informal recommendation made by the visiting mission at the time of their visit. This institution of an annual salary, we feel, will add to the prestige and dignity of these top positions.

The general administrative goal of replacing American staff with trained and qualified Micronesians has moved steadily forward. Since 1951 some 60 major positions held by Americans have been taken over by Micronesian counterparts. For example, during the past year two additional American hospital administrators were replaced, thus leaving only two districts at the present time with American hospital administrators. An additional finance officer position was filled by a qualified Micronesian with the result that all districts but one now have Micronesian finance officers.

Micronesians also are increasingly taking over senior administrative positions. In Palau, for example, during the past year the administration activities were divided into two major departments, those of public administration and administrative services, and each is headed by a Palauan. It is anticipated that within the near future these particular individuals may become our first assistant district administrators. Other districts also are grooming Micronesians for senior administrative posts. In Rota the administrative officer, a Rotanese, already has served on several occasions as acting district administrator and is the second-ranking officer of the district.

The training program for Micronesians in all fields was intensified during the year through the inservice training project at headquarters. Special training courses and inservice training also were in process at the district level.

Economic Development

Copra production, which had fallen in 1958 and 1959 due to the effects of several typhoons, increased during the past fiscal year to almost 11,000 tons. A favorable price on the world market during fiscal year 1960 resulted in income of approxi-

mately \$1,587,000, which was the highest level thus far attained in the territory.

In the first 9 months of the present fiscal year a total of 10,500 short tons of copra was produced, and if this rate of production continues, total copra production at the end of June 1961 may well reach 13,000 tons. A somewhat unfavorable market price of the past 6 months, however, has reduced the copra price paid to the producer this past year. Yet in spite of the falling market, we have been able, through our Copra Stabilization Fund, to maintain a price of \$110 for grade-one copra the past 6 months. Total revenue for the present fiscal year is anticipated to be about \$1,600,000. Unfavorable market conditions continued to bring about a decline in trochus production in the territory. The total revenue from trochus dropped from the \$174,000 figure of the previous year to \$148,000 for fiscal year 1960. Vegetable produce and fish export revenue, on the other hand, materially increased, almost doubling in the case of vegetable exports from \$60,000 in 1959 to \$104,000 in 1960. Fish export revenue rose from \$19,000 in 1959 to \$27,000 in 1960, and if local and interdistrict sales are added, fish revenue totaled approximately \$100,000 for the year.

Interest in cacao has been maintained at a high level. Two hundred and sixty-five thousand new trees have been planted since the cacao subsidy program started 2 years ago; the majority, 200,000, were planted since January 1961. The cacao subsidy program originally called for a quota of 100,000 trees, and all but 10,000 of these have been planted. The remaining 10,000 of the subsidy trees are scheduled for Palau and Yap Districts. The cacao program in these two districts is being intensified this coming year. It will be noted that as many trees have been planted by farmers on their own as have been planted under direct subsidy.

The first shipment of cacao, a sample shipment of 1,250 pounds, was sold in early 1961 on the world market and was rated as very good to excellent in quality.

From the interest demonstrated in the cacao program, the cacao specialist anticipates that there will be considerable increase in the number of plantings this coming year. Truk farmers have ordered 350,000 nursery planting bags, and Ponape farmers 250,000 planting bags. While not all these nursery seedlings will survive, it is

conceivable, particularly if the Yap and Palau plantings are added, that half a million new cacao seedlings will be planted this coming year.

As the visiting mission report indicated, interest and concern in economic development is prevalent at all levels. District economic development boards are taking an increasingly active role in local economic affairs. The activities of these boards include the organization of credit unions and cooperatives, fisheries projects, development of handicraft and small-scale industries such as charcoalmaking, boatbuilding, brick and ceramic manufacture, coir fiber products, and small-scale hydroelectric power projects in areas where such development is feasible. The district congresses and administration authorities are working closely with these local economic boards.

It has been noted by members of this Council in the past and by visiting missions that many small-scale industries and activities which flourished in the prewar era have not been rehabilitated or revived. Many of these activities were run by Japanese entrepreneurs and catered almost exclusively to the Japanese community or to the Japanese market. Others, like the sugar industry, were heavily subsidized by the Japanese Government for byproducts such as industrial alcohol. These activities were conducted in direct support of or in preparation for the Japanese war effort. In certain instances markets which formerly were found in Japan for local fiber products no longer exist, since synthetics now have taken over these markets. This administration, however, will make every effort to give encouragement and support to those industrial developments which offer promise for the local economy.

Since 1945 a number of detailed economic surveys have been made of the territory. The economic potential of the area, thus, has been quite well defined. We intend though to reevaluate all such economic reports and to update the analyses, in line with previous recommendations made by this body. Presently we are in the process of strengthening the economic staff at the headquarters level. Recruitment of an economic development officer as well as a marketing expert will be undertaken immediately. The first function of the economic development staff this coming year will be to bring up to date all available economic data concerning the territory, as well as to give support and aid to specific local developmental projects.

Strengthening of district economic administration activities also is under way. The district economic boards have been mentioned earlier, and each district has staff in the economic development field. Saipan District, for example, recently added an American economic development officer to the district staff, and it is understood that his service will be available for territory-wide programs in fields of his special competence. In other districts Micronesians hold these positions, with American staff members serving in advisory capacities on the local economic development boards.

Banking facilities now are available in three districts, in the northern Marshalls through the Bank of Hawaii branch in Kwajalein, in Saipan through the Bank of America, and in Truk District through a branch bank of the Bank of America. A fourth district, Palau, will have banking facilities within a few months, since a branch bank of the Bank of Hawaii is slated to begin operations there in late or early September of this year. The Saipan bank already has a Saipanese manager. In the other district banks there is an American resident manager. However, all other staff is Micronesian, and training programs under way call for eventual replacement of the American manager.

Mounting interest in credit unions and cooperatives is seen. During the past year five credit unions have been formed in Palau District alone, and this coming month a territory-wide credit-union training course for participants from all the districts will be conducted in Palau. A copra and cacao producing and marketing cooperative has been formed in the Truk Atoll. The members of the visiting mission had an opportunity to be in on the birth of this pioneer copra and cacao cooperative, and they will be interested to learn that the Faichuk Cooperative (named for the Leewards Islands of the Truk Atoll) already has 900 applicants, has raised \$3,000 in membership shares, and currently is negotiating for a loan of \$12,000 from the Administration Loan Fund for the purchase of copra-hauling boats. This loan, I can assure the Council, will be approved by the administration.

Additional improvement of our transportation system is anticipated this coming fall when a new field-trip ship, now being built to our specific requirements, will be placed in operation. This new ship will have cargo capacity equal to that of the

present larger ships now used for field-trip service; it will have increased and better passenger facilities and should be more economical to operate.

Agriculture

The program of coconut rehabilitation and replanting has been moving steadily forward. Approximately 300,000 selected seed nuts were distributed under the coconut development program this past year.

The typhoon rehabilitation programs initiated after the disastrous typhoons of 1958 and 1959 in the Marshalls, Truk, and Yap Districts are progressing very satisfactorily and all are ahead of schedule. In the areas of complete or almost complete destruction, however, it will be another 5 years before the new palms will begin to bear. Last December saw another disastrous typhoon strike in Yap District, but serious damage was confined mainly to Ulithi Atoll. Widespread destruction in Ulithi necessitated the establishment of a long-range relief and rehabilitation program. Since the visiting mission visited one of the islands of Ulithi Atoll before major clearing had begun and before long-range rehabilitation work had started, I particularly wish to report on the recent progress of this program. The American agriculturist who will be in charge of the Ulithi rehabilitation project is now on the job as are two Yapese extension agriculturists. Temporary schools and dispensaries have been built on all the islands which suffered damage. Funds for the construction of five permanent combination school and dispensary buildings, which also are to be used for typhoon shelters, have been set aside. Work on these will start as soon as the major replanting, which must have precedence, is under control. The clearing and replanting is under way on all the islands, but the severity of damage will necessitate some 12 to 18 months of hard work before the bulk of the major replanting will be completed. A food relief program has been established, and housing materials, tools, boats, and other essential items have been furnished to the inhabitants.

The agriculture extension program has been strengthened in all districts. A Territory Farm Institute, the first true agricultural training school in the territory, is being built in Ponape and is scheduled to open this coming January. The pro-

gram of sending promising students abroad for training in tropical agriculture has been accelerated. One scholarship from each district per year now is earmarked for study in tropical agriculture, and currently 10 agriculture scholarship students are studying agriculture in the Philippines.

One of the most significant developments in our insect eradication program has been the experimental work on Rota conducted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in collaboration with the Trust Territory and the U.S. Navy on the control of the serious pests, the oriental fruit fly and the melon fly, through the use of irradiated sterile flies. Several million sterile flies have been released on Rota since December 1960, and the experimental program should be finished by the end of this coming fiscal year. Work on the rhinoceros beetle control continues through biological and sanitation measures. Other entomological control activities are being carried out as part of a long-range entomological program.

Our fisheries development project, which is explained in detail in our annual report, received a setback some months ago by the death of the territory's fisheries management officer. A replacement reported for duty early this month, and the program again will soon be in full operation. Among the major scheduled goals for the coming year are the opening of a Trust Territory School of Fisheries in Palau, completion of a 25-ton freezing plant, and completion of fish storage facilities. These projects will be followed by the establishment of a pilot fish cannery, construction of suitable types of fishing boats, and other subsidiary projects. Smaller scale fishery development projects are also under consideration in the other districts.

Construction

Construction of needed facilities has continued in all districts. The new hospital for Palau District is over 85 percent completed. In Truk the dock project passed the halfway mark. As previously outlined to this body, the dock project at Truk is designed to give that district dock facilities capable of handling large oceangoing vessels. When the dock is completed, ships from the United States and elsewhere will be able to pick up copra and to discharge cargo at Truk. This is a major construction program which, when com-

pleted, should bring material benefits to the Truk area. In the Marshalls the construction of the new intermediate school buildings is well under way, and some of the buildings, such as school dormitories, should be in use with the opening of school this fall. The new intermediate school dormitories at Truk also will be ready for occupancy this fall. On Saipan two units are in operation in the new Hopwood Intermediate School. Five more units will be added during the coming year. Work has begun on new hospitals in the Marshall Islands and Saipan Districts. Elsewhere rehabilitation and construction of refrigeration plants, powerplants, administration buildings, administration housing, road repairs, and other activities were carried out during the year as part of the regular construction program.

Public Health

In six of our seven districts the district public-health programs are headed by qualified Micronesian directors of public health. The district health activities center around nine hospitals, from which all the medical service to outlying areas through health aides, dispensaries, and field-trip medical parties flow.

Postgraduate training for Micronesian medical and dental staff has been stepped up this year with the institution of a refresher program in special and general subjects for selected Micronesian medical officers at the naval hospital in Guam. A similar postgraduate course is under way for dental officers at the naval base dental facility in Guam, and an administrative training course for head nurses at the naval hospital will be conducted this coming year.

The first graduates of the new School of Dental Hygienists received their diplomas last week at the graduation ceremonies at Majuro, where the school is located.

Specialized public-health training in other fields, particularly in sanitation and laboratory work, was accelerated during the year. The sanitation department has held special courses for sanitarians at the district centers and has sent interdistrict sanitarian teams to work for a month or more at a time in selected districts. A special postgraduate training course for sanitarians currently is under way in Guam in cooperation with the Guam Department of Sanitation. Special teaching courses are conducted for laboratory

technicians at the various hospitals, and the chief laboratory technician additionally conducts special training programs for small interdistrict teams at times throughout the year.

A Micronesian, Mr. Nachsa Siren of Truk, who had been serving as acting director of sanitation, was appointed several months ago as director of sanitation and has the honor of being the first Micronesian division head on the High Commissioner's staff. Another Micronesian sanitarian now is being groomed for the position of assistant director of sanitation.

Tuberculosis, which is our major health problem, has continued to receive constant attention. By the end of June 30, 1961, the assistant director of public health will have completed the setting up of specialized tuberculosis treatment and control teams in all districts. The BCG vaccination program proceeds as a regular part of the tuberculosis control project.

Health education is conducted through joint efforts of the department of public health and department of education. The department of public health has established the position of health educator on the district public health staff to permit the expansion of this essential type of health education. District congresses also are showing increasing awareness in this aspect of health education. The Truk Congress, this past year, established and financed a health educator position in addition to the administration program.

Considerable progress was made this year on hospital construction, as indicated in my comments on the overall construction program. Additionally, the construction of a complete new hospital was started this month in Saipan. The clearing of the site and installation of water and power facilities are completed, and actual construction work on the buildings is slated to begin before the end of the month. When completed, the hospital will be entirely staffed by Saipanese.

A new hospital for Truk District is scheduled for 1963, and ground will be broken for it in late 1962. Budget plans for a new hospital for Ponape for fiscal year 1963 are also under consideration.

Education

It has been the aim of our education system to provide a type of education which would equip the Micronesians for more effective participation

in their developing society. Requirements for Micronesian leadership in all fields and the progress of social, economic, and political growth demand that the role of education and training must occupy a vital place.

Half of the population of our particular territory is under the age of 20. This dramatizes the many problems we face in our education program since all the usual problems of a developing educational system are magnified by a factor of a rapidly expanding school-age population. Here the great challenge lies, since it is these young people who will mold the future of Micronesia. We can meet this challenge only by the administration and the communities joining forces in an attempt to provide the best possible education in terms of local circumstances and needs for the youth of Micronesia.

Our annual report has a detailed description of our educational program, and I shall only cite a few noteworthy items of the past year at this time. One-fifth of our population—some 15,000—is enrolled in the public and private schools of the territory. The bulk of all district congress revenues goes for the support of the elementary school teachers.

District school boards and congresses working in collaboration with the administration departments of education have standardized teacher requirements and salaries.

For the past several weeks the social development subcommittee has been studying the problems of the elementary and intermediate schools in the districts. The committee's report will be one of the major items of this year's interdistrict conference. We propose also to discuss at this conference the comments and recommendations of the visiting mission on our educational program.

During the year a Trust Territory-wide curriculum for intermediate schools was developed and put into effect. The new unified curriculum has taken the best features of the various district intermediate school curricula, and its implementation should substantially improve the level of our intermediate school training.

Policies with respect to English-language instruction in the elementary schools will be subjected to careful reappraisal, especially in the light of the comments and recommendations made in the report of the visiting mission.

Our teacher-training program has been intensified in all districts, and continued and increased emphasis is planned for this vital part of our educational program. Planning is under way for the establishment of a teacher-training department as an adjunct of the Pacific Islands Central School.

The grant-in-aid project has been accelerated. Sixteen new elementary schools either have been built or are currently under construction through the grant-in-aid program. Others are anticipated for this coming year.

Advanced education outside the territory is an important aspect of the overall education program. The district congresses more and more are recognizing this importance, and the budgets of several congresses this year had appropriations for special scholarship aid. The administration continues its program of offering three scholarships per district each year in the fields of general education, agriculture, and vocational arts. Additional scholarships are given in special professional categories, in medicine, and in a variety of special categories.

Claim Settlement

The only remaining land claims of significance are those of Majuro Atoll and Kwajalein Atoll. As the Council is aware from previous meetings and reports, it has not been possible to reach a satisfactory agreement on settlement. However, active negotiations are now being conducted looking to a mutually agreeable and satisfactory settlement of this most perplexing problem.

Status of Displaced Marshallese

The general adjustment of the people of Kili and Ujelang has been satisfactory. Annual interest payments from their trust funds give the people of these two islands a regular cash income in addition to their subsistence economy and cash proceeds from the sale of copra. The agriculture rehabilitation program on Ujelang has been completed, and regular field service on an average of every 2 months has been maintained for the past 2 years.

At Rongelap the agricultural rehabilitation program has been virtually completed, and the American agriculturist has turned over the supervision of this program to a Marshallese extension

agriculturist. The medical survey on the Rongelap people was carried out last March by a team composed of Trust Territory medical staff and Atomic Energy Commission specialists. Preliminary results of this year's medical survey again indicated that no aftermaths of fallout are discernible and the general health of the Rongelapese is satisfactory.

International Relations

Contact with international organizations has been maintained on a number of levels. Three Micronesians during the year studied in the United States, the Philippines, and Burma under United Nations fellowships in the fields of social defense and social welfare. Headquarters and district staff personnel during the year participated in South Pacific Commission conferences in the fields of health education and cooperatives. Two Micronesian delegates currently are participating in a conference on youth problems now being held in the neighboring Trust Territory of Australian New Guinea.

War-Damage Claims

With respect to the question of war-damage claims, the United States Government recognizes that, as a result of damages suffered during the period of hostilities between the United States and Japan, certain inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands suffered loss of life, bodily injury, and damage to property. As a result of these damages there have arisen valid and just claims on the part of the inhabitants which must be satisfied. The United States recognizes its obligation as the Administering Authority of the territory to see to it that every effort is made to deal promptly and equitably with such claims.

This matter is considered by us to be one of the highest priority. Within the last 2 weeks our administration has taken action to institute an evaluation of the extent and nature of claims which may warrant compensation, and we have designated a task force to carry out that inquiry. We have advised the Japanese Government that we will resume negotiations with it on this subject as soon as this evaluation has been completed.

I am grateful to have this opportunity to present this brief summary. We shall attempt to provide any additional information which mem-

bers of this Council may desire in connection with the report of the visiting mission or our annual report.

STATEMENT BY MR. NAKAYAMA, JUNE 13

U.S./U.N. press release 3732

I feel honored and grateful to the Government of the United States and to that of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, which made it possible for me to have the opportunity to appear before the Trusteeship Council today and relay to the members of the Council warm greetings from the people of the Trust Territory that I have the privilege and honor to represent. It is hard for me to believe that I have traveled across the vast Pacific Ocean to New York to sit here in the Trusteeship Council. I am pleased to have the opportunity to meet again with the distinguished members of the United Nations Visiting Mission, with whom I had the honor and pleasure to travel and to serve as their interpreter at several lengthy meetings held on Truk earlier this year.

The people of Truk—my home district—especially wish to convey to the Trusteeship Council and to the members of the last United Nations Visiting Mission to the territory their sincere wish for a successful meeting and for everlasting success in the maintenance of peace and growth of opportunity for the peoples of the world over.

I am certain the firsthand experience gained from my visit with the Trusteeship Council will no doubt be of great value and assistance to me in my responsibilities as the president of the Truk District Congress, as a member of the Truk District political development team, and as economic and political development adviser to the district administrator.

Municipal Chartering Program

As a member of the political development team, Mr. President, I am charged with the responsibility of planning and coordinating our municipal chartering program under the guidance of the Truk district administrator. During the course of my career since 1958 as a member of this team, I have had the pleasure of seeing seven municipalities in the Truk District celebrate the receipt

of their charters. To me it was gratifying to view the effort and interest the people of these municipalities showed in preparing for their charters. And gratifying also is the fact that these people have since demonstrated satisfying ability in governing themselves in a democratic manner in accordance with procedures and laws they initiated. I am sure the same result is attained by people of the chartered municipalities throughout the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

As you are all aware, it is not easy to carry out political development work in communities where there are a great number of uneducated people and where there are strong conservative social and political traditions. The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands has within itself many such communities. There is also, of course, the different added problem of communication and transportation, although I think even this can be solved more easily.

I believe that, in order to preserve the good customs and traditions of the people of the Trust Territory, political development programs must be directed and carried out in such a manner that, when something either supplements or replaces an aspect of the existing structure, it does so only if and when the people concerned deem it desirable and necessary. In no way should it be forced upon the people of the Trust Territory. I would rather see them guided rather than led by the Administering Authority, for I feel it is their job to decide for themselves their own destiny in accordance with the goals of the trusteeship system.

Micronesians Conscious of Responsibilities

The program of replacing American personnel with qualified Micronesians as soon as feasible is one that needs close attention. American personnel should not be replaced by Micronesians simply for the sake of budgetary savings but only when the Micronesians are capable of taking over the responsibility.

Today the people of the Trust Territory feel much closer to their Government because they see their own brothers and sisters sitting in the chairs which not long ago belonged to their American predecessors. And instead of having to communicate through an interpreter, which was often embarrassing, in giving an account of one's trouble

to the American physician, the Micronesians are pleased to feel at home discussing their problems with their Micronesian doctors. I can recall the time when the people of Truk used to refer to the administration as the "American Office," a term which is no longer used. But because of the number of Micronesians in jobs formerly held by American personnel, the administration is today referred to as the "Big Office." This means to them that the office has bigger responsibilities but that it is theirs. In order to do a good job in the "Big Office," of course, the Micronesian realizes that he must educate himself.

The people of the Trust Territory, however, have been very fortunate to have the opportunity for free education at home and abroad under Trust Territory Government sponsorship. As the result of this program many promising young men and women are emerging and have acquired for themselves leadership status in their communities. Having the respect and confidence of the conservative older people in their respective municipalities, it can be assumed that they are the ones that will determine the future of the Trust Territory. Realizing, of course, the importance of education, more and more district congresses are now setting up scholarship funds to provide for opportunities for their young citizens to study abroad.

I am pleased to report that the Micronesians are quite conscious of their responsibilities and that they are undertaking ever-increasing responsibility. This to me underlines the steady growth of the people of the Trust Territory toward self-government.

The Truk District Congress

The Truk District Congress, of which I am a member and currently president, came into being in 1957, when it was incorporated after long preparation and as a result of a decision of the chief magistrates' conferences. It was on August 23, 1957, that the former Secretary of the Department of the Interior, Mr. Fred Seaton, presented to the Truk Congress its charter. This occasion marked the birth of the first Trukese legislative organ which was to deliberate upon matters of significance to the welfare of the Trukese community.

The emergence of the Truk District Congress also created a new era in the life of the Trukese people in that it carries home to the grassroots

of their communities the essence of democratic government, the ideas of equal representation and of freedom and equality under the law.

The Congress charter, to which I have referred, requires that members of the Congress be elected by secret ballot and by popular vote. This is the procedure that is used throughout the Trust Territory. As you all know, there are various sizes of population units, and to give equal representation in the Congress poses a special problem. On what basis would representation be achieved so that it is fair to both municipalities with only 30 people and those with a population greater than 3,000? The Congress charter provides that for every 500 people one representative must be elected from the municipalities with a large population and one representative from each of the municipalities whose populations are less than 500.

In order to function properly, each district legislative body imposes certain types of taxes, either upon general imports or otherwise, for the purpose of its budget. If I am not mistaken, the average budget of a legislative body in the Trust Territory is approximately \$40,000 a year. The Truk District Congress this year has a budget of nearly \$50,000, and \$36,000 of that is for the payment of elementary school teachers' salaries. This year \$3,000 has been appropriated for the United Nations Day program. This is \$1,000 more than the sum appropriated last year. Other districts finance the United Nations Day program in one way or other, and the people of the Trust Territory celebrate the anniversary of United Nations Day as one of the most significant occasions of the year.

The district congresses can be viewed as the training base for the Trust Territory people who may in the future form a territory-wide legislative body, but I believe that the desire for a territory-wide legislative body must come from the people of the Trust Territory rather than being forced upon them by the Administering Authority or the United Nations. I can assure you that the time will come when the people of the Trust Territory shall demand that they have such an organization.

Education and Inservice Training

Though we can say that we are better off in modern technology than our forefathers, there still are many problems confronting us. We must

educate ourselves in order to bring ourselves closer to the rest of the rapidly changing world. But thanks to the Administering Authority and the United Nations, scholarships now are enabling competent young men and women of the Trust Territory to receive the kind of education that they would not otherwise have.

Despite their limited budgets, the district congresses in the Trust Territory also are setting up scholarships for qualified young men and women of their districts to study abroad, usually in specially designated fields such as agriculture, sanitation, general education, and the like. This summer, for instance, the Truk Congress is awarding a \$1,000 scholarship to 12 prospective students for special study at the College of Guam. These 12 young men already hold key positions with the Trust Territory Government.

Among these special summer scholars are the director of sanitation for the entire Trust Territory, the Truk District representative of the Public Defender, the Truk District representative of the Public Prosecutor and currently acting land title officer, the principal of Moen Elementary School, two intermediate school teachers, the Truk District assistant land surveyor, the assistant land title officer, a personnel clerk, an assistant statistical analyst, and a senior employee from the United States Weather Bureau in Truk District.

Agreement was reached between the Congress and the administration that, since this program is, in a way, an inservice training program of the scholars, the Trust Territory Government will continue to pay the salaries of those in its employment during the 3 months they will be in school at Guam. Under the same arrangement Palau District is sending 12 senior teachers and key personnel from their education department, while Ponape District is sending 2.

Detailed plans for this program, including rules of conduct and housekeeping, are strictly their own. From their number they are to elect one overleader and an executive board which will deliberate upon matters of general interest to them all.

In my opinion this sort of program is extremely valuable from all points of view. It is a program that will bring together the potential leaders of the territory. And by virtue of their being together over a period of 3 months, they will cer-

tainly learn from each other to understand better how to meet the needs of all the people of the Trust Territory. Because of the various values derived from a program such as this, our Congress did not hesitate a bit in awarding the sum of \$1,000, which in our budget is a sizable amount.

These are but a few of the significant steps that the people of the Trust Territory are taking in striving forward for self-sufficiency. We believe that it is through educating ourselves in the modern ways that we will be able to determine for ourselves our future status and attain our destiny.

The Trust Territory grant-in-aid program is a commendable one, for without it the building of good elementary schools and community buildings by the people of the Trust Territory alone would have been impossible. I need not describe this program, for I believe you are already familiar with it from the reports of the Administering Authority. But I do wish to emphasize that we benefit greatly from this program and that we have great need for this form of assistance for many more years to come.

Progress in Social Development

There are a number of encouraging changes that have taken place in our social life. People who once were reluctant to accept modern medicine and sanitation now realize that they were unwise.

The Administering Authority has done a great job in training Micronesian medical officers and other personnel in other fields of work within the Trust Territory governmental setup. There is not a single hospital in the Trust Territory, except that of Saipan District, that is not staffed and operated by Micronesian directors. The Micronesian medical officers have proven capable, and they have an advantage over a foreign doctor in that they have a greater understanding of their Micronesian patients and their troubles. In the education field we see a gradual taking over by Micronesians of the jobs formerly held by Americans.

The grouping together in various schools of Micronesians, who to me are more different than alike in their ways and cultural beliefs, unites them and enables them to see their similarities and differences and develop in themselves a feeling of friendship and mutual ties. It is here that

the future of the Trust Territory is being built by the hands of our men and women who will some day lead their people toward attaining the goals of the trusteeship system. Pacific Islands Central School, the University of Hawaii, and the College of Guam, for example, are the places where Micronesians get to know each other well.

There are in the Trust Territory various special types of organizations. In my district, for example, there is a women's organization whose membership includes Trukese and American working women. This organization's officers at the present time are all Micronesian women. This group meets every month to exchange ideas and learn from one another about their different ways of life. Although there are many obstacles that stand in the path of our social development, nevertheless encouraging progress is seen throughout the territory.

In closing I wish to say that your continued assistance and guidance have been well directed and well received and that the people of the Trust Territory continue to benefit from them. To the Administering Authority we are most indebted for the constructive programs it has carried out during all the years of its responsibility.

Again I wish to thank you for this opportunity to appear before this body and to express the appreciation of the people of the territory for the interest this body has in our welfare.

CLOSING STATEMENT BY MR. GODING, JUNE 23

U.S./U.N. press release 3736

On behalf of my colleagues, Mr. Nucker and Mr. Nakayama, I should like to express their deep appreciation for the kindness and courtesy extended to them by members of this Council. I know that Mr. Nakayama will take back to the people of the territory the warm expressions of friendship that have been extended to them by the Trusteeship Council. Mr. Nucker, who cannot be here today, wishes me to convey his heartfelt thanks for the tributes paid him by members of this body during this session. I concur in these expressions that Mr. Nucker carried out his duties as High Commissioner in a devoted and outstanding manner and that he will be sorely missed by the inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

For my own part I wish to express my apprecia-

tion to all members of the Council for the kind words of welcome they extended to me. I am especially grateful, Mr. President, for the patience and courtesy you have demonstrated toward me during the course of the meeting.

I propose to make a very brief concluding statement, since I feel that the exhaustive examination which has been made of the visiting mission report and our annual report during the past 2 weeks has covered almost every aspect of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and has presented clarification on almost all points. I do wish, however, to comment briefly on several specific points brought out in the questioning and in the general debate.

I have been most impressed by the sincerity with which the members of the Council have approached the problems of our Trust Territory. Though we might not necessarily agree with all the interpretations, suggestions, and recommendations, I have felt that, with the exception of those made by one delegation, all have been offered in a spirit of cooperation and constructive assistance. As such, they are worthy of serious reflection on our part, and I can assure the Council that they will receive careful review.

I am grateful for the interventions of the distinguished chairman of the visiting mission, Ambassador [Carlos] Salamanca [of Bolivia], as well as those of his colleagues on the mission, during the questioning to amplify certain sections of the visiting mission report. These amplifications I found to be most helpful and informative. They aided me greatly in placing the visiting mission report in proper perspective.

Encouraging Development of Self-Government

As I assume my duties as High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, I am deeply aware that Micronesia, once remote, isolated, and little touched by the outside world, is entering the mainstream of the political and economic life that is now quickening the entire Pacific area. It is our role as Administering Authority to encourage and assist the people of the Trust Territory to participate actively and fully in this development. Our own attitude was aptly summarized by the distinguished representative of Paraguay in the following words:

... we wish to do everything possible to advance the moment when the people of the Trust Territory of the

Pacific Islands, like the peoples of other Territories, have achieved a sufficient degree of political maturity and training to enable them to establish their own political institutions and decide their own destiny.

The development of a Trust Territory-wide political consciousness and the establishment of central government organizations in which Micronesians will play roles of rapidly increasing responsibility are matters of great concern to this Council and to the Administering Authority. This concern underlies the interest in such specific areas as the transfer of the Northern Marianas District to civilian administration, the remodeling of the Inter-District Advisory Committee as a legislative body, and the location of the headquarters within the Trust Territory.

The Inter-District Advisory Committee was organized some 6 years ago and has been looked upon as the future legislative organ of the Trust Territory. We have outlined certain concrete steps which are being taken to establish within the near future a legislative council solidly based upon the experience and knowledge gained from the Advisory Committee. At the risk of repetition, we should like to point out again that it is proposed at the next session to create a holdover subcommittee on political development. Its work will supplement and round out the work of the older social development and economic development subcommittees.

Secondly, the Saipan District will send delegates to the September meeting of the committee, rather than observers as in the past. We anticipate that the active participation of the Saipan representatives as delegates will be a major contribution to the work of the committee. Thirdly, we shall work toward the popular election of all delegates to the Inter-District Committee.

Local Participation in Government

In my opening statement I commented that, if the present rate of political growth and progress continues, we envision the existence of a territorial legislative council by 1965. We believe that the present rate of growth will continue and, in fact, hope that it will accelerate. We do not, therefore, regard 1965 as being the earliest possible date for the creation of a territorial legislature. It will be our policy to advance this date, if possible, and we are hopeful of being able to do so. Thus, we can assure the distinguished representative from the

United Arab Republic and his colleague, the distinguished representative from France, that, for our part, we shall seek to speed the formation of a territorial legislative council.

A word is necessary with respect to the location of the Trust Territory Government headquarters. I hasten to point out that the Administering Authority agrees that ultimately the headquarters should and will be located within the Trust Territory itself. While we would further agree that the location of national capitals has frequently been a matter of historical happenstance, we also believe that the people can and should have an opportunity to influence the selection, as has been the tradition in the United States. To this end I have suggested that the Inter-District Committee should meet in the various districts so as to enable each member to become familiar with each district and thereby form a considered and informed judgment as to the future site of the capital of the Trust Territory.

The United States delegation has also been glad to hear the views of the visiting mission and members of the Council with respect to the desirability of unifying the administration of the entire territory under the High Commissioner. As we have already stated to the Council, this matter has been receiving most careful attention at the highest level of our Government, and I can now further say that the departments concerned are agreed in principle that the administration of the territory should be unified. The detailed steps for bringing about this unified administration are now in process of being worked out.

As essential underpinnings of political development, emphasis in the past has been put upon the development of democratic institutions at the municipal and district levels. For a people who a few short years ago had little concept of a political identity beyond the village or clan, the development of representative self-government separate and apart from traditional allegiances has progressed satisfactorily and rapidly, given the geographic circumstances of the Trust Territory and its diversity of languages and cultures. We propose to continue and to intensify political education and training programs in the districts. It is, after all, on the local level that any people come into close and continuing contact with their government. It is on the local level that participation in governmental processes is a real and personal experience to the average individual.

As the distinguished representative from Belgium stated last Wednesday, "The rapidity with which a territory can be led to the stage where it would be in a position to govern itself is directly proportionate to the number of problems which are entrusted to the local leaders."

Reference has been made to the program of chartering municipalities, and the thought has been expressed that the goal of chartering at least 10 municipalities each year might be increased to 15 or 20. We would subscribe to the philosophy of this proposal, but in doing so we must point out that the chartering of a municipality is meaningful only when the people of the municipality understand the concepts embodied in the charter. We believe that the substance, not merely the form, of representative institutions is important.

The visiting mission suggested in its report that ways and means should be found to expand the effective functions of the district congresses. Through the subcommittee on political development, through strengthening our political affairs staff, and through the efforts of the district congresses themselves, we are confident that these legislative bodies will achieve increasing authority and responsibility. This matter will, of course, receive our full attention.

In connection with the development of the district congresses and governmental institutions in general, I should like to quote a line from the visiting mission report. On page 20 the mission stated:

Though strong attachment to tradition still exists in several parts of the Territory, the elders are beginning to recognize that responsibility should be placed in the most capable hands irrespective of a person's position in traditional society.

We fully share the view of the visiting mission that this is an encouraging development, and we submit that this development is due in large measure to policies of patient and progressive training and education in the political field. As the distinguished representative from the United Kingdom stated yesterday, "The touchstone of political advance must be the wishes of the people themselves."

Our goal has been to turn over positions of authority to trained and qualified Micronesians in a continuing replacement program. Some 60 important positions have been taken over by Micronesians in the past 10 years, and with the

intensification of our training program, both in-service and scholarship training outside the territory, this rate of replacement should continue.

A number of delegations expressed concern over the fact that senior administrative positions such as district administrators and assistant district administrators have not, as yet, been taken over by Micronesians. The distinguished representative of India during the course of the questioning commented that it was his opinion, based on his observation in the territory, that the administration already possessed a pool of competent young administrators and therefore our target goal of one or more assistant district administrators by 1964 appeared to him to be rather slow. Other members of the Council put forth somewhat similar views. I agree completely that we have a corps of young, able administrators undergoing training from which our potential senior administrators will come. Our problem now is not one of seeking suitable candidates but one of providing the opportunity for seasoning and experience which a district administrator or assistant district administrator must possess if he is to do a good job for his district and his people. The Council may be assured that Micronesians will be placed in senior positions as rapidly as they gain the necessary experience and demonstrate their competence to handle these assignments.

Progress in Social and Educational Fields

It was encouraging to note the expression of confidence voiced by the distinguished representative of Burma in the progress being made in the social and educational fields. There are many problems to be solved, but I am confident that, given the continued and wholehearted support and cooperation of the people of Micronesia, we shall continue to achieve steady advancement in these important areas. As I indicated in my opening statement, the social development subcommittee of the Inter-District Advisory Committee currently is engaged in studying social and educational problems and will present a report of findings and recommendations at the forthcoming meeting of the territory-wide conference of the Inter-District Advisory Committee this fall. This conference will pay particular attention to elementary education problems.

The rapidly expanding school population is posing difficult problems for the local communities

and for district congresses which provide the funds for payment of elementary school salaries.

The recommendation made by the distinguished representative of New Zealand, and concurred in by the distinguished representative of China, that the administration should give additional direct financial aid to the elementary school districts, specifically in the support of teachers' salaries, is one to which we shall give every consideration.

I wish also to note that the administration already has under study the point brought forth by the distinguished representative of India on the lowering of the compulsory age of schooling from the present 8-year level. Over 1,000 children under the age of 8 years presently are enrolled in public and private schools. In any case I wish to assure the representative of India that this recommendation, which also was made by the visiting mission, will receive every consideration at the forthcoming Inter-District Conference when problems of education are discussed.

It was gratifying and encouraging to hear the favorable comments of members of this Council on the general health program of the administration. I use the words "gratifying and encouraging" deliberately since this is a program which is completely handled by Micronesian district directors of public health and their staffs. The commendations of the various members, thus, will mean a great deal to these dedicated young Micronesian men and women who are working so valiantly in the field of public health in their communities.

I am particularly pleased to carry back to our public-health staff the special interest in their work which was expressed by the distinguished representative of Australia.

I can assure the Council that we shall make every effort to provide the technical assistance and aid that the Micronesian medical officers may request. We are in full agreement with the visiting mission that increased attention must be given to the improvement of health services to the outlying islands. This, indeed, is one of the major programs of the Department of Health and one which shall receive the highest priority.

Economic Potentials of the Area

Action to speed programs which will increase the productivity of the territory and provide higher living standards has received the greatest

emphasis in the report of the visiting mission, in the questioning by members of the Council, and in the very thoughtful and constructive statements made in the general debate. This emphasis on the economic field is by no means misplaced.

The relevant relationship of the economic field to that of the political was effectively highlighted in the careful and well-phrased concluding statement of the representative of the United Kingdom. I would only add that this relationship to political development is one that also pertains to each of the other major areas under review, the social and educational. It relates, also, to land tenure. A sound approach to land use is obviously of fundamental importance to the economic future of the territory.

While we have found the visiting mission report to be most helpful and generally constructive, we cannot concur with some of the rather sweeping and unqualified observations in paragraph 73 in the introductory chapter on economic advancement. The mission report states flatly, for example, that "... the Territory's main natural economic resources have not as yet been exploited." We agree that they have not yet been fully developed and that, with respect to the resources of the sea, for example, they have so far been little exploited in the commercial sense of that term. However, we believe that the basic agricultural resources have been developed to a very considerable extent and that sound programs for upgrading the agricultural productivity of the area have been initiated. As we have pointed out during the discussion, a good start has been made in commercial fishing.

Moreover, it seems to us that this particular paragraph in the report might be interpreted to suggest that the territory enjoys great natural economic resources, above and beyond those already developed and in process of development. That this is not the case, at least to any considerable degree, is clearly indicated by other, more specific paragraphs of the report.

Great emphasis has properly been placed on the need for intensification of our efforts in the economic field. As I repeatedly indicated during the questioning period, we feel that the time now is at hand for an intensification of our effort. Our economic staff is being strengthened, and I hope to increase materially the resources which

can be used for an economic development revolving fund.

The potentials of the area are not unknown. Surveys in almost every field have been undertaken in the past, and, as I elaborated in an answer to the distinguished representative from Australia, in the past several years we have had followup studies carried out in such areas of potential development as mineral resources, forestry, fisheries, trochus, cacao, coconut fiber products, and the like. I have stated that I conceive the first task of the strengthened economic section at headquarters essentially to be one of updating past surveys, as well as developing plans for broad and integrated economic development, rather than the conducting of a new basic economic survey. I would like to assure the distinguished representative of Burma that, when I remarked that some of the past economic surveys were "out of date," I did not mean to imply that the basic resource data of these surveys were outmoded. I was referring primarily to the fact that marketing conditions may have changed and that the supply-and-demand factors should be reevaluated in terms of present-day conditions.

I assure the members of the Council that the many detailed recommendations in the economic section of the visiting mission report will receive careful attention. We are, indeed, most appreciative of the various suggestions made by the visiting mission in the fields of agriculture, fisheries, poultry, handicrafts, as well as in matters pertaining to transport and communications. As was noted by the representative of the United Kingdom, we have already taken action on a number of recommendations made by the visiting mission in this field and very likely will act favorably on others after further study. Certain recommendations we may not agree with or find feasible at this stage of economic development. But, again, I would assure the representative of the United Kingdom that, even though from our viewpoint certain recommendations, to use his terminology, might seem "somewhat fanciful," they will receive the same careful consideration that will be accorded to all others.

In summary, the United States delegation agrees with the report of the visiting mission and with various proposals by members of the Trusteeship Council that increased economic development of

the territory is most important and is indeed basic for the advancement of the territory toward the objectives of the charter and the trusteeship agreement. The Administering Authority will give careful attention to these proposals and will see what further funds can be made available for stimulating the much-needed economic progress of the territory.

Situation of Rongelapese People

I would be remiss were I not to comment further upon the situation of the people of Rongelap, 82 of whom were exposed to radioactive fallout in 1954 as the result of a most regrettable mischance. There appears to be no question among the medical personnel who made an intensive study last March that the general physical health of the Rongelapese is satisfactory. The team has advised me that the physical complaints of the Rongelap people who were actually exposed to radioactive fallout are no more numerous than those of the larger, unexposed population on the island. The medical team found no existing physical illnesses attributable to exposure to radioactive fallout.

With regard to the statement in the visiting mission report that the complaints of the Rongelap people are confirmed by the local health aide, I should like to point out, first, that the mission itself questioned the competence of the health aide and, second, that as one of the persons exposed to fallout, the health aide in question cannot be considered a disinterested observer. As we have previously stated, this health aide continues at his post at the specific request of the Rongelap people. We shall, nonetheless, continue regular physical examinations, making every effort to minimize their psychological impact on the Rongelap people.

The visiting mission and many members of the Council have suggested that rehabilitation efforts be intensified, including the stationing of American personnel on Rongelap to live among the people and so to help allay their fears. I should like to point out that an American agriculturist had been stationed on Rongelap for almost 2 years to assist the Rongelapese in reestablishing agricultural enterprises.

In my opening statement I mentioned that the agricultural rehabilitation program has now been virtually completed and that the American agri-

culturist had turned the program over to his capable Rongelapese extension agent. The step of withdrawing the American agriculturist was partly taken in a further effort to encourage the community to stand on its own feet.

It should also be pointed out that the problems of rehabilitation are vastly complicated by the fact that many relatives of the people of Rongelap have moved to the island. There are now more than 200 people living in a community which in 1954 numbered 82. The stresses and strains resulting from this influx of population have added considerably to the psychological problems which must be overcome in the rehabilitation of Rongelap.

As to various other matters touched upon in the general debate, I believe that they are sufficiently covered in statements previously made by me or by Mr. Bingham.⁴

In closing, Mr. President, may I state that, as in previous years, we shall make available to Micronesians throughout the territory the summary records of this meeting and the closing statements of all of the delegations. I might further add for clarification that these records will be distributed within the next few weeks, since it is our practice to have them reproduced in quantity by our own reports office. Thus, Micronesian leaders, staff members, students, and others will have the complete record for study before the end of July.

There is keen interest in the deliberations of this body throughout the territory, and, rather than wait for the official printed records, which do not reach us for many months, we have felt it well worth while to issue preliminary reports so that the people of the territory may have them as soon as possible after the closing of the debate on our territory.

We shall also be glad to prepare and distribute, as suggested by the visiting mission in paragraph 71 of its report, a document explaining the objectives of the trusteeship.

May I again thank you, Mr. President and all of the members of the Council, for your interest in the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

⁴Jonathan B. Bingham, U.S. Representative in the Trusteeship Council.

United States Delegations to International Conferences

GATT International Textile Meeting

The Department of State announced on July 13 (press release 494) that George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, would serve as chairman of the U.S. delegation to the International Textile Meeting of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), held at Geneva July 17-28. Warren M. Christopher, Special Consultant to the Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, Department of State, served as alternate chairman. Other principal members of the delegation included:

Delegates

Walston S. Brown, Consultant to the Assistant Secretary for Domestic Affairs, Department of Commerce

John W. Evans, acting chairman of the U.S. delegation to the fifth round of GATT tariff negotiations, Geneva, Switzerland

Hickman Price, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Domestic Affairs, Department of Commerce

Leo R. Werts, Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Labor Affairs, Department of Labor

W. Willard Wirtz, Under Secretary of Labor

As a part of a seven-point program of assistance to the U.S. textile industry, President Kennedy directed the Department to call a conference of principal textile exporting and importing countries.¹ The purpose of the Geneva meeting is to seek agreement on arrangements for the orderly development of trade in cotton textile products.

Other members of the delegation included:

Advisers

Emerson M. Brown, Trade Agreements Division, Department of State

Sydney M. Cone III, Special Consultant to the Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, Department of State

Edelen Fogarty, Commodities Division, Office of International Resources, Department of State

William Kling, Chief, Functional Intelligence Division, Department of State

Thomas R. McMullen, Textile and Clothing Division, Department of Commerce

Margaret Potter, Economic Officer, Resident U.S. delegation to International Organizations, Geneva, Switzerland

William John Stibravy, First Secretary, Economic Office, U.S. Mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European Regional Organizations, Paris, France

A. Henry Thurston, Director, Textile and Clothing Division, Business and Defense Services Administration, Department of Commerce

Secretary of the Delegation

Marian S. Stilson, Office of International Conferences, Department of State

TREATY INFORMATION

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Automotive Traffic

Convention concerning customs facilities for touring. Done at New York June 4, 1954. Entered into force September 11, 1957. TIAS 3879.

Accession deposited (with a reservation): Rumania, January 26, 1961.

Customs convention on temporary importation of private road vehicles. Done at New York June 4, 1954. Entered into force December 15, 1957. TIAS 3943.

Accession deposited (with a reservation): Rumania, January 26, 1961.

Cultural Property

Convention for the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict, and regulations of execution; Protocol for the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict.

Done at The Hague May 14, 1954. Entered into force August 7, 1956.¹

Accession deposited: Mali, May 18, 1961.

Trade and Commerce

General agreement on tariffs and trade, with annexes and schedules, and protocol of provisional application. Concluded at Geneva October 30, 1947. TIAS 1700.

Admitted as contracting party: Sierra Leone, April 27, 1961.

Declaration on provisional accession of Israel to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Done at Geneva May 29, 1959. Entered into force for the United States December 19, 1959. TIAS 4384.

Signature: India, May 17, 1961.

Ninth protocol of rectifications and modifications to the texts of the schedules to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Done at Geneva August 17, 1959.² *Signatures:* New Zealand, May 10, 1961; India, May 17, 1961; Federal Republic of Germany, May 26, 1961.

Declaration on relations between contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the Government of the Polish People's Republic. Done at Tokyo November 9, 1959. Entered into force November 16, 1960. TIAS 4649.

Signature: Turkey, May 26, 1961.

Declaration on provisional accession of Argentina to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Done at Geneva November 18, 1960.²

¹ BULLETIN of May 29, 1961, p. 825.

² Not in force for the United States.

³ Not in force.

Signatures: Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, May 9, 1961; India and New Zealand, May 17, 1961; Czechoslovakia, June 2, 1961.

BILATERAL

Argentina

Agreement relating to investment guaranties under section 413(b)(4) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 847; 22 U.S.C. 1933). Signed at Buenos Aires December 22, 1959.
Entered into force: May 5, 1961; provisionally in force from December 22, 1959.

Liberia

Agreement providing for the furnishing of military equipment and materials to Liberia. Effected by an exchange of notes at Monrovia May 23 and June 17, 1961. Entered into force June 17, 1961.

DEPARTMENT AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Appointments

Charles Henry Lee as Director, U.S. Operations Mission, Chile, effective July 9. (For biographic details, see Department of State press release 487 dated July 11.)

Resignations

Adolf A. Berle, Jr., as Chairman of the Task Force on Latin America, effective July 31. (For text of a letter from President Kennedy to Mr. Berle, see White House press release dated July 7.)

PUBLICATIONS

Recent Releases

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. Address requests direct to the Superintendent of Documents, except in the case of free publications, which may be obtained from the Department of State.

Tracking Station in Island of Bermuda. TIAS 4701. 5 pp. 5¢.

Agreement with the United Kingdom, effected by exchange of notes—Signed at Washington March 15, 1961. Entered into force March 15, 1961.

Relief Supplies and Equipment: Duty-Free Entry and Exemption From Internal Taxation. TIAS 4702. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement with Paraguay, amending the agreement of April 4, 1957. Effected by exchange of notes—Signed at Asunción December 27, 1960, and March 7, 1961. Entered into force March 7, 1961.

Mutual Defense Assistance: Disposition of Military Equipment and Materials. TIAS 4703. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement with Federal Republic of Germany, amending the agreement of June 30, 1955. Effected by exchange of notes—Signed at Bonn March 9, 1961. Entered into force March 9, 1961.

Experimental Communications Satellites, Intercontinental Testing. TIAS 4704. 2 pp. 5¢.

Agreement with United Kingdom, effected by exchange of notes—Signed at London March 29, 1961. Entered into force March 29, 1961.

Mutual Defense Assistance: Equipment, Materials, and Services. TIAS 4705. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement with Bolivia, effected by exchange of notes—Signed at La Paz February 9, 1961. Entered into force February 9, 1961. Operative retroactively November 18, 1960.

Foreign Service Personnel: Free Entry Privileges. TIAS 4706. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement with Indonesia, effected by exchange of notes—Signed at Washington March 23 and 31, 1961. Entered into force March 31, 1961.

Investment Guaranties. TIAS 4707. 5 pp. 5¢.

Agreement with Chile, effected by exchange of notes—Signed at Santiago July 29, 1960. Entered into force February 15, 1961.

Surplus Agricultural Commodities. TIAS 4708. 4 pp. 5¢.

Agreement with Peru, relating to the agreement of February 12, 1960. Effected by exchange of notes—Signed at Lima October 4 and December 27, 1960. Entered into force December 27, 1960.

Surplus Agricultural Commodities. TIAS 4709. 5 pp. 5¢.

Agreement with Indonesia, supplementing the agreement of November 5, 1960. Effected by exchange of notes—Signed at Djakarta March 2, 1961. Entered into force March 2, 1961.

Economic Cooperation. TIAS 4710. 11 pp. 10¢.

Agreement with Republic of Korea, effected by exchange of notes—Signed at Seoul February 8, 1961. Entered into force February 28, 1961. With agreed minute and exchange of notes.

Surplus Agricultural Commodities. TIAS 4711. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement with Iceland, amending the agreement of April 6, 1960. Effected by exchange of notes—Signed at Reykjavik February 27, 1961. Entered into force February 27, 1961.

Economic Assistance. TIAS 4712. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement with Colombia, effected by exchange of notes—Signed at Washington March 30 and April 4, 1961. Entered into force April 4, 1961.

Exchange of Official Publications. TIAS 4717. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement with Viet-Nam, effected by exchange of notes—Signed at Saigon April 4, 1961. Entered into force April 4, 1961.

Africa. Assistant Secretary Williams Plans Second Trip to Africa	192	The Underlying Crisis: Coercion vs. Choice (Rusk)	175
American Republics. Berle resigns as Chairman, Task Force on Latin America	218	United States and Soviet Union Begin Air Transport Talks	197
Atomic Energy. Soviet Union Urged To Agree to Nuclear Test Ban Treaty; Item Proposed for 16th Session of U.N. General Assembly (texts of U.S. and Soviet notes and U.S.-U.K. letter)	184	United States Replies to Soviet "Troika" Proposal (Rusk)	183
Aviation		United Kingdom. Soviet Union Urged To Agree to Nuclear Test Ban Treaty; Item Proposed for 16th Session of U.N. General Assembly (texts of U.S. and Soviet notes and U.S.-U.K. letter)	184
Aviation Discussions Concluded by U.S. and Netherlands	197	United Nations	
United States and Soviet Union Begin Air Transport Talks	197	Soviet Union Urged To Agree to Nuclear Test Ban Treaty; Item Proposed for 16th Session of U.N. General Assembly (texts of U.S. and Soviet notes and U.S.-U.K. letter)	184
Brazil. U.S. To Help Brazil Develop Economy of Northeast Area (Kennedy)	196	The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (Goding, Nakayama)	201
Chile. Lee appointed USOM Director	218	United States Replies to Soviet "Troika" Proposal (Rusk)	183
China. The Underlying Crisis: Coercion vs. Choice (Rusk)	175		
Congress, The		<i>Name Index</i>	
Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy	200	Berle, Adolf A., Jr	218
Department Presents Views on Bill To Promote U.S. Foreign Commerce (Rusk)	198	Coombs, Philip H	193
President Proposes Amendments to 1962 Foreign Aid Budget	200	Dean, Patrick	191
Department and Foreign Service		Goding, M. Wilfred	201, 212
Appointments (Lee)	218	Kennedy, President	196
Resignations (Berle)	218	Lee, Charles Henry	218
Disarmament. The Underlying Crisis: Coercion vs. Choice (Rusk)	175	Nakayama, Tosiwo	208
Economic Affairs		Pilington, Francis T. P	191
Department Presents Views on Bill To Promote U.S. Foreign Commerce (Rusk)	198	Rusk, Secretary	175, 183, 198
GATT International Textile Meeting (delegation)	217		
U.S. To Help Brazil Develop Economy of Northeast Area (Kennedy)	196		
Educational and Cultural Affairs. New Learning Processes for Developing Nations (Coombs)	193		
Germany. The Underlying Crisis: Coercion vs. Choice (Rusk)	175		
International Organizations and Conferences. GATT International Textile Meeting (delegation)	217		
Mutual Security			
Lee appointed USOM Director, Chile	218		
President Proposes Amendments to 1962 Foreign Aid Budget	200		
U.S. To Help Brazil Develop Economy of Northeast Area (Kennedy)	196		
Netherlands. Aviation Discussions Concluded by U.S. and Netherlands	197		
Nigeria. Prime Minister of Nigeria To Visit United States	197		
Non-Self-Governing Territories. The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (Goding, Nakayama)	201		
Presidential Documents. U.S. To Help Brazil Develop Economy of Northeast Area	196		
Public Affairs. The Underlying Crisis: Coercion vs. Choice (Rusk)	175		
Publications. Recent Releases	218		
Treaty Information			
Aviation Discussions Concluded by U.S. and Netherlands	197		
Current Actions	217		
U.S.S.R.			
Soviet Union Urged To Agree to Nuclear Test Ban Treaty; Item Proposed for 16th Session of U.N. General Assembly (texts of U.S. and Soviet notes and U.S.-U.K. letter)	184		

Check List of Department of State Press Releases: July 10-16

Press releases may be obtained from the Office of News, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C.

No.	Date	Subject
484	7/10	Rusk: National Press Club.
*485	7/10	U.S. participation in international conferences.
486	7/11	Visit of Prime Minister of Nigeria (rewrite).
*487	7/11	Lee sworn in as Director, USOM, Chile (biographic details).
488	7/11	Coombs: American Council on Education.
489	7/11	Rusk: letter to Senate Commerce Committee.
†490	7/12	Jones: Senate Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees.
*491	7/13	McKinney sworn in as Ambassador to Switzerland (biographic details).
*492	7/13	Cultural exchange (Tunisia).
493	7/13	Aviation talks with Netherlands.
494	7/13	Delegation to GATT international textile meeting (rewrite).
495	7/14	Williams: trip to Africa.
496	7/14	Rusk: Soviet "troika" proposal.
497	7/15	U.S. note to U.S.S.R. on Geneva test ban negotiations.
499	7/15	Air transport negotiations with U.S.S.R.
500	7/15	U.S.-U.K. letter to U.N. on test ban treaty.

* Not printed.

† Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS INC
EDITORIAL DEPT
313 N FIRST ST
ANN ARBOR, MICH
DSB-DEC

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300
(GPO)



the
Department
of
State

AID IN ACTION

This 63-page booklet contains numerous examples of the accomplishments of United States technical and financial aid extended over the past decade to the underdeveloped countries around the world.

Publication No. 7221

25 cents

U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

This question-and-answer pamphlet explains what is meant by the "U.S. balance of payments" and reviews what has happened in recent years. It also outlines the objectives of the President's 14-point program of February 6, 1961, designed to eliminate the "basic" deficit and improve the longrun balance-of-payments situation.

Publication No. 7194

15 cents

URGENT NATIONAL NEEDS

This 37-page illustrated pamphlet contains the text of President Kennedy's special message to the Congress, which he delivered in person on May 25, 1961.

Publication No. 7204

20 cents

Order Form

To: Supt. of Documents
Govt. Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed find:

\$ _____
(cash, check, or money
order payable to
Supt. of Docs.)

Please send me _____ copies of

- ☐ AID IN ACTION
- ☐ U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS
- ☐ URGENT NATIONAL NEEDS

Name: _____

Street Address: _____

City, Zone, and State: _____

